

21st March 1923]

### III

#### PRESENTATION OF PETITION.

The RAJA OF RAMNAD :—“ I have in my hands a petition prepared and signed by fifteen Dikshitars of the famous Nataraja temple of Chidambaram. It is signed by them as representing the 300 Dikshitars attached to the temple and it conforms to the conditions laid down in the Standing Order for the presentation of a petition. I therefore beg to present this petition.”

### IV

#### MOTIONS ON THE BUDGET FOR 1923-24.

#### DEMAND XXIV—INDUSTRIES—*cont.*

#### MOTION No. 184.

Mr. A. M. MacDOUGALL :—“ The motion that stands in my name runs as follows :—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 75,000 for the School of Arts by Rs. 100.*

My intention in moving this motion is to raise a discussion on the report of the Committee that was appointed to investigate into the conditions of the School of Arts and to reorganize it. The report of that Committee which is in my hands has been published for the information of the public. All that I say is that the School of Arts is evidently another of those institutions in which technical education and industrial workshops are combined. The Director in the report which he laid before this Committee states that this school is not a workshop; but, evidently, he sells all the materials produced by the School of Arts, because in the revenue side of the Budget I find an item of Rs. 6,000 as income derived from this source. One other peculiarity about the School of Arts is that the Government have an item in the Budget which is not mentioned under any other head by the Department of Industries, namely, a bill-collector on a salary of Rs. 23 to Rs. 35. Perhaps that may be a printer's mistake, or may be an artistic name to another Government official. If the School of Arts is not a manufactory for selling goods and issuing bills on that account, I do not see the necessity to have the item of a bill-collector, and I do trust the hon. the Minister for Development will consent to a reduction of this entry and eliminate this particular official.

“ From the report, which I have in my hands, I am sorry to learn—and I hope the House will also see that—that the Committee which was appointed to reorganize the School of Arts would not take the power to compel the Director of the School of Arts to appear before them to give his evidence orally, in addition to what he said in his written memorandum.”

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU :—“ Superintendent, Sir.”

Mr. A. M. MacDOUGALL :—“ One would have thought that in any enquiry it was necessary for an official to appear before the Committee. I am also very pleased to learn from the report that my hon. friend, Dr. Natesa Mudaliyar, who is one of the shining lights of the Ministerial Party, says :

According to this report I do not consider the maintenance of so costly a craft school involving over Rs. 75,000 per annum is necessary under the present circumstances. Nor do I feel that an extra grant is necessary in consequence of any re-organization. We have a number of similar institutions in the Presidency; besides this, the crafts that are taught in the School of Arts are sufficiently advanced in the Presidency and can be picked up easily elsewhere.

[Mr. A. M. MacDougall]

[21st March 1923]

"Another thing in the Superintendent's report is this. He states:

We might even occasionally supply to firms or individuals men who are doing good work in drawing and design.

I have often suggested to the hon. the Minister for Development that this scheme might be extended. I know, from the figures that have been supplied to me, that the School of Arts has been in existence for nearly 30 years."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU :—"For nearly fifty years."

Mr. A. M. MACDOUGALL :—"I thank the hon. Minister, Sir. But I find there is still a great dearth of students qualified in drawing and design who are supposed to be turned out by this school. Recently, a firm in Madras wrote to the Superintendent of the School of Arts asking for his assistance in engaging a man qualified in minor designing and free-hand drawing. After a little interval, the Superintendent was reminded of the application sent by the firm. The reply from the School of Arts was that the letter had been put on the notice board and that no applications had been received. I think it would be advisable if the hon. the Minister for Development impresses upon the Superintendent of the School of Arts the necessity of assisting firms who are in need of such classes of labour. Another case is this: a firm asked the Superintendent of the School of Arts whether he could get for them a man who was trained in the system of making or procuring a certain design. That application was also turned down with the remark that it had been placed on the notice board and no response had been received. I trust that in the face of these facts the School of Arts will be thoroughly reorganized; but in the light of the remarks made by Dr. Natesa Mudaliyar in the report for the reorganization of the School of Arts, one would be inclined to think that there will be no necessity to keep it at all."

Khan Bahadur Muhammad USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—"Sir, I take some interest in the School of Arts. Recently, I was one of the Members of the School of Arts Reorganization Committee appointed by the Government under the presidency of the hon. Mr. Justice Oldfield. This Committee inspected the School of Arts and thoroughly examined the various questions connected with it and came to the conclusion that there was nothing wrong with the school. This Committee was appointed as a result of the resolution moved by my hon. friend, Dr. Natesa Mudaliyar. After carefully investigating the whole matter, this Committee found it essential to state that there was nothing wrong with the school. The Committee say:

It is a satisfactory feature of the present administration that the number of students of the artisan class has considerably increased and it would be sorry if a change were to be made which would probably render the school less popular with such students by an unnecessary postponement of the stage at which specialized instruction would be given.

Again they say:

The existing engraving class at the school is appreciated and doing good work and the Committee recommend no change at present.

"As regards the number of students that were in attendance in the school, the figures are as follows and they show a steady increase:—

1913-14	..	..	..	256	1921-22	..	..	..	286
1919-20	..	..	..	222	1923	..	..	..	299
1920-21	..	..	..	241					



21st March 1923]

[Muhammad Usman Sahib]

So the students are increasing year after year and I find that out of the students turned out from this school 40 per cent are doing the work which they have learnt in the school. It should be remembered that in England out of the total number of students turned out by such schools only 27 per cent find employment."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" Were the 40 per cent employed in the Government institutions or private institutions ? "

Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—" Both in Government and in private institutions. What I want to say is that about 40 per cent of the students turned out by this school are able to earn their livelihood in the trade they learned. As such there is not the least justification for the abolition of the institution as has been suggested."

Mr. A. M. MACDOUGALL :—" I said that I wished to reorganize the institution."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" May I have some information about the remaining 60 per cent ? "

Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—" Reorganization is impossible if the school is abolished. What I wish to point out is that the school is doing work and that 40 per cent of the students turned out by the school are earning their livelihood by means of the crafts they have learnt in the school. Such a school ought to be maintained by the Government."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" He has not told us about the other 60 per cent as yet, Sir ? "

Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—" There the students are taught goldsmithy, metal work, carpet weaving, engraving, basket weaving and other useful things. I do not see any reason why anybody should grudge this grant for an institution which has been equipping about 300 students a year to earn their livelihood by honest means. I strongly oppose the motion."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" Sir, whatever the result of the voting on this proposition may be, there can be no doubt that the arguments advanced for the retention of the school by Mr. Usman are very unconvincing. If any condemnation of the school was wanted, I think that has been abundantly furnished by my hon. friend Mr. Usman. Because what does he say ? He says that in spite of all the exertions on the part of those who are interested in the maintenance of the school they have not been able to provide work for more than 40 per cent of the students."

Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—" I said that in England only 27 per cent of the pupils turned out by the institutions found employment. Still they maintained such schools."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU :—" Forty per cent are those about whom we have been able to get information. This does not mean that the others did not get work. Many had their own shops. For instance, goldsmiths have been working in their own houses."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" Without going through the portals of this school, people have been able to find work for themselves as goldsmiths."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU :—" The school gives instruction to all irrespective of their castes."

[21st March 1923]

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"I do not quite follow the hon. Member."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU :—"I was saying that most of these professions were caste professions ; so that, though no doubt in the villages some teaching is given, that teaching is limited to the caste to which the profession belongs. For example, the goldsmiths learn their profession from their elders. In this school, on the other hand, a man of any caste can learn it."

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—"I am afraid that the statement that only goldsmiths learn goldsmithy is not quite correct. I would ask the hon. the Minister to make inquiries to see if he is correct."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"The information furnished by the Minister would have been of great value if he had taken some trouble to find out who were the people that learned that work. I do not think that such a thing has been done. In the face of the remarks made by Mr. Arumainatha Pillai I do not think there is much to be said on either side. I myself had been to the school and I must express my disappointment with the school and the way in which it is managed. I do not know whether the students are taught to paint or to draw caricatures. The only thing they are taught there is furniture making. That furniture finds a sale at the hands of the officials ; because when I asked for some furniture I was told that they were intended for so and so, and that I could not have it. If that is the purpose of the school I am for its closure rather than its continuance."

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—"I thank the hon. Member, Mr. MacDougall, for making a kind reference to me. I may return the compliment and say that he is not less to the community that he represents than he described me to be to my community."

Sriman SASIBHUSHAN RATH Mahasayo :—"Who is the leading light ?"

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—"I am glad that he does not want the abolition of the school. He wants only its reorganization. I think this amendment comes too soon. It was only in September 1921 that I moved a resolution that the school should be reorganized and that the Government should appoint a Committee for the same purpose. The Government appointed a Committee with the hon. Mr. Justice Oldfield as the president, and among its Members the Committee had the Director of Industries and the Director of Public Instruction in addition to other experts. The majority found the school working satisfactorily, especially the engraving department which attracted some of the artisan children. And as my hon. friend Mr. Usman told us, 40 per cent of the students were getting employments in various places and firms. That does not mean that the others went without any work. They set up private practice and most of them got on very well. I wrote a dissenting note. By that I did not mean that I did not want the institution. I wrote it on the lines of the needs of my country and my own tendency. We do not want that goldsmith's work should be taught there. We are experts in that. I do not think that any expert from the West will excel our Acharis and Viswakarmas here. So, let me not be mistaken for having condemned the school. But I condemned the school as it was then existing. Now, the Government has issued a Government Order. It is not



21st March 1923]

[Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar]

very satisfactory. I only wish that our Minister, who is a people's man, will take into consideration the wishes of the people and will not deny the effort to see that the school is raised to the level which the country expects it to be."

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR :—" Mr. President, Sir, I wish to make one observation. I think the Council is thankful to the hon. Member, Mr. MacDougall, for his criticisms. The Council has to welcome criticism, and especially constructive criticism of the kind advanced by the hon. mover. My hon. friend, Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, and my hon. friend, Dr. Natesa Mudaliyar, have also passed rather severe criticisms with regard to the method of work followed in the School of Arts. At the same time, Sir, the hon. Member, Mr. MacDougall, spoke of the need for reorganizing the school. I think, Sir, the time has come not only for reorganizing the School of Arts, but for reorganizing education of the kind imparted in schools of that description. Recently, at the instance of the hon. the Minister for Development, a committee was appointed to investigate the question of industrial and technical education. I hope the report of the Committee will be available very soon to hon. Members, and there is scope for criticism—criticism which should be very helpful. While admitting, therefore Sir, the desirability of having criticism and the need for having valuable helps both in the shape of criticism and in the shape of expert advice, no case has been made out actually for closing that school. Sir, the words of the hon. mover were that if it was impossible to reorganize the school—absolutely impossible—only then was the other alternative course, viz., total abolition, to be taken up. But, I think, considering the general demand of the Indian public for more and more of this kind of education, expert advice will be forthcoming and the hon. the Minister, who has been hearing all the arguments advanced, will so reorganize the institution and not only that kind of education, but also technical and industrial education throughout the Presidency so as to make them all as perfect as it is possible for human institutions and educational methods to be."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU :—" Mr. President Sir, before proceeding to answer certain criticisms, I may be permitted to state that one sentence in my hon. friend Mr. Natesa Mudaliyar's dissenting minute has not been correctly interpreted. That sentence says that he did not agree with the majority report that if the school was to be remodelled on the lines on which the majority wanted it to be remodelled, which consisted of striking out items of work, then he thought it was unnecessary. Anyone who reads the report carefully will find that he supported the school from the beginning to the end. Therefore, Sir, any criticism or argument based on the remarks of Mr. Natesa Mudaliyar does not hold good. My hon. friend said, Sir, that these trades could be picked up elsewhere. Now, Sir, it is not correct to say that the trades that are taught here can be picked up elsewhere unless it be in the caste circles. There are a number of trades which are taught here and to which my hon. friend, Mr. Usman, made reference. He did not separately mention such of those items as were taught only in the school. In the whole of this Presidency there is not a single school in which the following subjects are taught: goldsmithy, engraving, lac-work, cotton painting, modelling and design. They paint colours on cotton. Well, Sir, if there is no other institution which does this work, the existence of this school is justified. Moreover there is the other consideration that there are at present something like 299 pupils, which number is larger than it has hitherto been.

[Mr. K. Venkatareddi Nayudu] [21st March 1923]

The whole school came under the fire of criticism only recently. The report is already in the hands of hon. Members. Government have followed only the majority report. Of course, we could not follow the minority report of Mr. Natesa Mudaliyar though in order to satisfy his criticism in some respects I particularly insisted that design and drawing should be taught. I am not quite aware of this item of bill-collector. Of course, Mr. Thomas will explain it. It is such a small item that my attention was not drawn to it hitherto. However, I will see that it is investigated.

"My hon. friend stated that applications were made on behalf of certain firms for supplying men trained in free-hand drawing. All that I can say is that it is difficult to say why men were not available for taking up service except it be that all those who had been trained had obtained service. However, Sir, I shall take interest in this matter and see that it is com-

11-30 a.m. municated to the Superintendent, so that he may endeavour his best to send the best possible persons whenever they are required; because it must be one of the endeavours of the institution to supply hands whenever they are wanted and in order to train more men for meeting the various demands, I hope the Council will allow me to increase this provision of Rs. 75,000 and not reduce it. As I have said, Sir, I will look into the whole matter to the best of my ability. I therefore hope that my hon. friend will not press his motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

#### MOTION No. 185.

Mr. A. M. MacDOUGALL :—"Sir, I beg to move—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 50,000 for contingencies under Fruit-Preserving Institute by Rs. 25,000.*

The Fruit-Preserving Institute is another one of those legacies which my friend, the hon. the Minister for Development, has received from his predecessors. As far as I know, fruit-preserving and preparation of jam are generally done only when there is a surplus of fresh fruits. The idea of preserving fruit is to make it useful when the season for fresh fruits has passed. I have yet to know that there is any fruit in the Nilgiri hills which is worth preserving. There is a certain kind of fruit there, but it is of such a poor quality that it is impossible to preserve it. It may be made up into jam, but only at the expense of three or four times the bulk of sugar that would be necessary for preserving ordinary fruits. Having tried to make this point clear, I think there is no necessity for this Institute. Unfortunately the Department of Industries thought there was a certain amount of fruit to be preserved, and they built a factory first. No, first they engaged a Superintendent to go round the country, who was certainly experienced in making household jam which had been known to hundreds of housewives in the Nilgiris for generations. This Superintendent was sent on deputation to learn the trade, so that after coming back he could properly supervise. Then, having got the Superintendent and built the Institute, they proceeded to discover where they were going to get the fruit to be preserved. Recent information given to me tells me that certain experiments are being carried on in the Nilgiris, possibly in a more intensive manner than has been done in the past, to try and get the fruit in order to supply it to the Institute, and a certain portion



21st March 1923]

[Mr. A. M. MacDougall]

of the hills is under the course of demolition at present in order to make an orchard to supply the fruit to this Institute. Having got all that in Coonoor, they evidently never thought about the suitability of Coonoor as a centre for this industry. When one starts an industry he has to see if the locality where it is proposed to be started is a suitable one. No doubt, Coonoor has a beautiful climate. But the cost of carrying the produce by railway takes a good deal of money. I am at one with the hon. the Minister for Development in his great ideal of improving this presidency industrially. But I am not at one with him in frittering away the money on so-called industries that lead to nowhere. His great ideal is to have industries which will provide employment for people and whose products will be used by the people. I want to ask this House, how many people, excluding the Europeans of the country, are addicted to preserved fruit and jam? Is there a Hindu or a Muhammadan who is addicted to jam or to preserved fruit? Now, I ask, what is the use of spending Rs. 58,000 on this kind of industry which will possibly help one or two individuals. As I said, there is something wrong with Madras in private capital not being used on industries, and I rather wish that this sum of Rs. 58,000 is spent on a scheme of research which will show what exactly is wrong with Madras that nobody comes here to transform the presidency into a huge industrial one. I understand that the Superintendent of the Institute is under contract for three years. It is not very nice to take contracts; but contracts can be broken at a price. My own view in reducing the allotment by Rs. 25,000 is that the remaining Rs. 25,000 will enable the hon. the Minister for Development to sufficiently recompense the Superintendent if the contract is broken."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" Mr. President, Sir, I oppose the motion of my hon. friend, Mr. MacDougall. He has asked the Members of this House one question. Of course he used the word 'addicted'. But I take it that he meant to ask whether the Muhammadans and the Hindus are in the habit of using jam. I may tell him on behalf of my Hindu friends and on behalf of my Muhammadan friends also that we are in the habit of taking this jam."

Raj Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—" I deny that charge."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" I shall exempt my Brahman friends. I will speak on behalf of all my non-Brahman friends, and I believe the statement holds good with reference generally to my Muhammadan friends also. After all, the object of my hon. friend Mr. MacDougall's proposition is to close down this factory. Now, certain facts have to be remembered in connexion with this proposition. In the first place, about Rs. 70,000 have been sunk in the construction of the necessary buildings and factories for the purpose of manufacturing the jam and the manufacture was actually commenced only in December 1922; so that hardly three months have expired since the commencement of this business. My hon. friend Mr. MacDougall is certainly a business man and I ask him whether as a business man he would recommend the closing down of a business that has been in existence only for three months."

Mr. A. M. MACDOUGALL :—" As a businessman I would not have started this Jam Factory, as has now been done."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" Then I may tell him that this was started at the instance of another gentleman who, I believe, knew business very well and who was in Government service for about 35 years. It was on

[Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

[21st March 1923]

the strength of the recommendation made by Sir Frederick Nicholson that this Jam Factory was started. I believe there is no impropriety in my comparing the business capacity of Sir Frederick Nicholson and the business capacity of my esteemed friend, Mr. MacDougall. If my hon. friend, Mr. MacDougall, as a businessman, thought that he would not have started this factory, Sir Frederick Nicholson did want this factory to be started."

Mr. A. M. MacDOUGALL :—"Sir Frederick Nicholson was not spending his own money. He was spending the taxpayers' money."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU :—"I want to take exception to that Sir. If there is one that deserves being honoured in an assembly like this, it is that distinguished man, and if any aspersion is cast on him, I must protest against it."

Mr. A. M. MacDOUGALL :—"I have not cast aspersions on any one's character. I only stated the truth. The Jam Factory belongs to the Government and I said that he was using Government money. I take strong objection to the hon. Minister stating that I did anything to detract from the credit of Sir Frederick Nicholson's character."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU :—"When he said that Sir Frederick Nicholson was not spending his own money, what is the inference?"

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"My hon. friend, Mr. MacDougall, is against spending tax-payers' money on this business. Whether Sir Frederick Nicholson and my friend, the hon. the Minister for Development, are right in spending the tax-payers' money on this business; has to be determined hereafter by the vote of the House on this motion; and I venture to think that this House will, by a very large majority, throw out the motion of my hon. Friend, Mr. MacDougall. That is the test whether the Government are right or not in spending the tax-payers' money on this industry. My hon. friend, Mr. MacDougall, stated—not to-day but at the time of the general discussion on the Budget—that he had tasted the jam and found it good. I believe he stated that it was very good. I do not know why he should be so very particular now in closing down this infant industry which produces very good jam. Then again, he had also stated that there was no market. He stated this as one of the objections, in his speech on the budget, for continuing this factory. With reference to that, as I stated once before, this industry has been in existence only for a very short time and it is hardly time for those who are in charge of this factory to find a market. With reference to another Government industry, namely, the manufacture

11-45 a.m. of soap, Government have appointed salesmen on commission for the sale of soaps. As a matter of fact, the Government soap factory at Calicut is not able to produce enough to meet the demand; so that if the same salesmen who are employed in finding market for the soap are charged with the duty of finding markets for jam also, there will be no extra-cost involved and no difficulty will be felt for finding a suitable market for jam. My friend's motion is not for a token reduction, but out of Rs. 50,000 provided under Contingencies for this manufacture he wants as much as Rs. 25,000 to be taken away. The result must necessarily be to close down this factory. But the Government, I believe, have budgeted for a pretty large amount of receipt also under this head, and the result of accepting this resolution will be to cut down that receipt. I shall go further and say that even if this industry is to be worked at a loss, seeing that it is a



21st March 1923]

[Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

Government industry intended as a sort of demonstration factory to others, it is desirable and very necessary that even at a loss it should be worked for the purpose of inducing others to undertake such business. For these reasons I oppose the proposition of my friend."

Mr. T. SIVASANKARAM PILLAI :—" Sir, without committing myself to any remarks on the fruit preserving factory in Coonoor, I wish to take strong objection to the insinuation conveyed by the remarks of my hon. friend Mr. MacDougall, that Sir Frederick Nicholson was only spending the taxpayers' money. He had been the Collector of our district for a long time, and my hon. friend, Mr. Kesava Pillai, and myself knew him intimately. He belonged to the old order of civilians of the time of Sir Thomas Munro. He is cherished in our memory. It is he that started the idea of co-operation which is spreading now. He was a man who had always the welfare of our country in his heart. I am not competent to say anything about the state of this industry, because I have no personal knowledge; but as a businessman Mr. MacDougall may be entitled to every consideration at our hands."

Mr. R. K. SHANMUKHAM CHETTIYAR :—" Sir, very often, I do not agree with my hon. friend, Mr. MacDougall, in his views regarding the industrial developments of our country. But I must say, in this particular instance, I agree with a great deal of what he said. I myself know a bit of this business, and when I came to know that a jam factory was to be started, I had my own doubts as to whether there were on the Nilgiris enough of fresh fruits which may be converted into jam in this factory. I know, Sir, that this Jam Factory is one of the results of the various hobbies which Sir Frederick Nicholson was engaged in after his retirement from Government service; so that I would like to know from the hon. the Minister whether, before this factory was started, Government had received any report from him or any other person who was responsible for recommending the starting of this factory, as to the possibilities of getting fresh fruits to be preserved, the sources from which they had to be got, how much of them could be got from the Nilgiris and how much could be taken to the Nilgiris from other sources. I should like to know from the hon. the Minister whether any report was obtained giving any idea as to these facts. No doubt, Government must, even working at a loss, undertake the starting of certain industries, so that it might be an inducement to others to start concerns of this nature. But I have my own doubts whether the manufacture of jam can be classified in that category of pioneer industries which have to get the impetus from Government example. I should agree with my hon. friend, Mr. MacDougall, in spite of the authority given on behalf of the Hindu community by my friend Mr. Krishnan Nayar, that jam is not an article of food used by the Hindu community, whether Brahman or non-Brahman—in this affair I am sure there is no party government—so that the market for this product must be found in the European community. If we are to understand the psychology of the European community here, when there are two articles available in the market one produced in India and the other coming from England, they would rather demand the English article, even though a little costly. One of the examples of that attitude is the demand which our tinned fish from Malabar has in the European market here in India. It has been repeatedly said by those who are responsible for the manufacture of tinned salmon or other fish that it is cheaper than English tinned fish, if not better also; but at the same time we see very few people, at least among

[Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar] [21st March 1923]

Europeans, going in for tinned fish prepared in Malabar. So that what I should like to ask the hon. the Minister is, that though this Jam Factory was a legacy, an unfortunate legacy, which he had to inherit from his predecessor, what justification Government had in venturing upon this new industry. It was with this idea of eliciting information that I also tabled a motion for reduction."

Mr. C. R. T. CONGREVE:—"Mr. President, I rise to support my hon. friend, Mr. MacDougall's resolution. My chief reason for doing so is that having some slight knowledge of the Nilgiri Hills, I feel sure that there is not sufficient fruit available to keep a Jam Factory working, and I must doubt whether it will be possible to manufacture one ton of jam a year. If the hon. The Minister could carry out researches as to the possibility of making the waste products of coffee into jam, there might be some opening for the factory."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU:—"I make spirit out of coffee pulps and not jam."

Mr. C. R. T. CONGREVE:—"My hon. friend opposite Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar compared the Jam Factory with the Soap Factory, but I contend that whereas there is no lack of raw material for the latter, there is a lack of fruit to keep a Jam Factory going."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"I rise to offer a personal explanation. What I said was that the same agents that were finding purchasers for soap might be utilized for finding purchasers for jam also; and that was in answer to my hon. friend, Mr. MacDougall, who said that there was no market for this article."

Mr. C. R. T. CONGREVE:—"I regret I misunderstood my hon. friend. I still hold the view that it should be definitely ascertained whether there is sufficient fruit available in the Nilgiris, before heavy expenditure is entailed on a Jam Factory."

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTIYAR:—"I beg to oppose the motion. As is sometimes the case, a businessman may not realize during the first few years all that he expects. When private capital is shy, Government must set an example by starting such new industries. If without allowing sufficient time for the institute to prove its utility we make motions to shut it down, it will be a pity and private individuals will not come forward to take up such undertakings. I therefore oppose the motion."

Diwan Bahadur P. KESAVA PILLAI:—"Sir, I think the country is indebted to Sir Frederick Nicholson for many of his hobbies. This hobby of making fruits into jam was meant, I think, to teach the people of this country the art of making jam not only of the fruits that may be got from the Nilgiris, but also of such fruits as mangoes growing on the plains. We are importing jam from England and it is used not only by the European community, but also by the Brahmans—excepting perhaps some orthodox Brahmans like my hon. friend, Mr. Narasimhacharlu—and by non-Brahmans, though not the common people; and all these are making use of the jam that is imported. The object of the industry is to teach people the art of making jam, so that they may thrive on it. But I think the arguments advanced against it seem to suggest that jam is only consumed by the



21st March 1923]

[Mr. P. Kesava Pillai]

Europeans and that the jam that may be produced in this industrial centre at Nilgiris will not be bought by others. All these arguments are beside the mark, because the industry is meant to teach the people the art of making jam out of fruits. Therefore I strongly support the Government in this matter."

Mr. E. F. THOMAS :—" It was somewhat of a surprise to me to learn from the speech of my hon. friend, Mr. Krishnan Nayar, that the two great parties in the House are divided on the subject of jam. Mr. MacDougall levelled against the Government, not this Government, the charge of having inherited some unpalatable legacies. He said that we started the Jam Factory and then discovered that we had not got the fruits to turn into jam—a singularly unbusiness like thing to do. But the facts are different. It is perfectly true that this institute was initiated and built on the advice of Sir Frederick Nicholson. Mr. Shanmukham Chettiyar wanted to know if the Government went into the business without preliminary reports. The answer to that is,

12 noon. no. I have in my hand, G.O. No. 1677, Revenue (Special), dated the 3rd September 1919, in which the whole question of initiating fruit-preserving and jam-making in this particular institute on the Nilgiris is discussed at great length. In the course of the report (printed in this Government Order) Sir Frederick Nicholson has very clearly pointed out to Government that at that time there was not really a great supply of fruit on the Nilgiris. However, I think my hon. friend, Mr. Congreve, rather underestimates the fruit possibilities of the Nilgiris when he said that the fruits were not enough. This is what Sir Frederick Nicholson says:

As mentioned in my note of 1917 and demi-official of January 1919 there is a great variety of fruit, actual or potential, on the Nilgiris and in their vicinity, I am quite aware that the present supply is scattered and even scanty regarded as the supply of a large factory.'

"He goes on to say—

It is to a considerable extent scanty just because of the absence of a large and regular demand. . . . Hence a steady local demand by the cash purchases of a factory will at once increase the existing supply, sufficiently for experimental work, and will gradually develop the supply, especially of the more quickly grown fruits (tree-tomatoes, tipari, etc.) to satisfy the increasing demand. No one ever expects to find everything ready to hand for the starting of a brand new industry; the industry develops the supply which feeds the industry; it is a continuously widening and reacting circle.

"Therefore, the object of starting this industry on the Nilgiris was to stimulate and to find out an outlet for the growth of fruit on the Nilgiris and elsewhere. If you want to improve the growth of your orchards, unless you offer an outlet for the fruits, you cannot do so. I suppose everybody in this House will agree that it is a good thing on the whole if some fruit trees could be made to grow where there were no trees before. I do not know whether my hon. friend opposite will accept that point.

"My hon. friend Mr. Krishnan Nayar it was who said that this was a very young industry and that it was rather too much to expect it to be developed into a full-grown industry at once. It is an infant enterprise my hon. friend Mr. MacDougall says in effect. 'It is a weak infant. Cut down its food. Give it half rations.' If you cut down the allotments for raw materials by half, next year he will be in a position to tell the Council, 'I told you so'. I always said it was a weakling. Now give it a decent burial. That will be the effect of accepting this motion for reducing the allotment for the purchase of raw materials by half. If he wanted to close the factory, it would have been more logical to move to omit the allotment altogether.

[Mr. E. F. Thomas]

[21st March 1923]

“There is another point I should like to place before the House, and that is if this motion is accepted it will be necessary to write off on the receipt side something very considerable. We have now got to spend a good deal more than Rs. 50,000 which the Finance Department has given. But if the provision is further reduced, it seems to me very probable that what is budgeted on the receipt side of this item will disappear altogether.”

Mr. A. M. MACDOUGALL :—“May I ask what is likely to be expected on the receipt side or hoped to be expected?”

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU :—“Rupees 80,000 on the receipt side, Sir, against which the Director has asked for Rs. 70,500.”

Mr. E. F. THOMAS :—“One more word, Sir. I think it will be a pity, as suggested by Mr. Namburumal Chettiyar, to stop the operations. I think it is perfectly fair to say that if this business does not appear to be profitable or does not attain a stage of prosperity within a reasonable time, then a motion of the kind we are discussing now would be much more proper than it probably is at this stage.”

Mr. A. E. RENCONTRE :—“Mr. President, I have heard the extract read by the hon. Member, Mr. Thomas. I do not think he has read any extract to show that this factory satisfies a public need, or that there has been any popular demand for the establishment of such a factory. That, I think, is the test that should be applied when you are applying public money for an industry of this kind. Anybody who goes to the Nilgiris knows that the climatic conditions there are not suitable for the cultivation of fruits. We are sometimes having too much rain and sometimes too frequent rains, and the rains are not spread throughout the seasons of the year. Again, I have not heard anything in the report that was read to show that the climatic conditions of the Nilgiris are suitable for fruit-farming. As has been pointed out by Mr. MacDougall and the hon. the Member representing the planting community, all the fruit that we have got now is what is known as the ‘shandy fruit.’ Such fruit really costs a good deal to preserve; the sugar you have to purchase for preserving it is far more costly than the fruit itself, and the fruit is too poor for preserving. Of course, what the Government might have had in their mind might be that if the climatic conditions were suitable to go on with an extensive and intensive farming, in five or six years from starting the factory you could improve the position. It seems to me, therefore, that this factory will certainly not satisfy a public need and will certainly not be a profitable undertaking. If there is a need for fit, you may rest assured that private enterprise will take it up. This seems to be an undertaking for private enterprise. I do not think that this factory is anything in the shape of a nation-building industry. What we really want in laying out public money is that it should be for an industry which will satisfy a public need. Let us focus our energy, let us concentrate our forces in building up such industries. What is the use of frittering away money on an institution of this kind? I think some hon. Members will no doubt say that at first we may lose some amount of money. But why should we spend more and more money such as Rs. 20,000, or Rs. 30,000 or Rs. 50,000 and venture to make further commitments so as to lose more money in the future. I think the hon. the Minister for Development will be well advised to close down the industry now instead of entering into further difficulties, or, if possible, to hand it over to private enterprise.”



21st March 1923]

Mr. A. M. MACDOUGALL :—“ Mr. President, I just like to make a few remarks on what has been said regarding my motion. In the first place, my hon. friend, Mr. Krishnan Nayar, said that I had admitted that the jam produced by the factory was good. I agree with that. I do not think why that should be adduced as a reason for the tax-payers' money being spent on this particular object. I do say that the jam is good. But that does not mean that I should not make this motion.

“ Then, he also mentioned something about salesmanship, and he spoke about what I had said in the Council one or two months ago about the extent of profits. I am afraid he has somewhat misconceived what I said, and the hon. the Minister has also proceeded on a wrong impression. What I did say was that there was great difficulty for the Government to sell their manufactures after they had made them. At present, the Government consider that they can give a margin of 5 per cent to cover the selling cost. That would be sufficient in many cases. My point was that the selling cost was sometimes much more than the actual manufacturing cost.

“ Another point regarding salesmanship noticed by Mr. Krishnan Nayar was the possibility of handing over the jam to soap-travellers. I would like to read with your permission a little passage to be found on page 33 of the report of the Director of Industries for 1921. It says :

The system of selling the products of the factory through the agency of three travellers, with headquarters at Calicut, Madras and Masulipatam respectively, was continued during the year. The west coast traveller was successful in introducing a considerable volume of business during the year in spite of the unfavourable conditions of the market; the volume of orders obtained by the Madras traveller was not so satisfactory, while the amount of business introduced by the traveller for the Telugu districts was very disappointing.

That is a very good argument which goes against handing over the jam to the soap travellers.

“ I think my hon. friend, Mr. Krishnan Nayar's idea of an institute was to teach the people of this country how to make jam. If that is so, why in all conscience have the Government established the institute at Coonoor? If they are going to teach the people how to make jam, is Coonoor the place for the institute?

“ The hon. Member, who is the Director of Industries, said that if this allotment was cut down, I would probably come next year and say ‘ I told you so; you can make no profit’. I did not say anything myself to mean that. What I said was that the idea in my mind in moving for this reduction was to allow the hon. the Minister for Development to get out of his contract with the Superintendent and to allow him to pay the man some solatium, and to enable him to close down the factory altogether.”

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU :—“ Mr. President, most of the points that I wanted to mention to the House were perhaps mentioned either by my hon. friend, Mr. Krishnan Nayar, or by my hon. friend Mr. Thomas, and there is not much to say for me. But I must point out one distinction which if it is mentioned would clear a good deal. If I am not mistaken, Mr. MacDougall's criticisms were based on the assumption that this is an industrial concern, pure and simple. It is no doubt true to some extent. But the object of this, as stated by Sir Frederick Nicholson (who, I may mention to the House is just now in England, who is still working on all these matters, and who has not given up his connexion with the industries

[Mr. K. Venkatarreddi Nayudu] [21st March 1923]

of Madras but has still further committed himself on our behalf for considering more machinery, etc., required for us), was 'mainly experimental and demonstrational'. Well, Sir, it is to be remembered that this is merely experimental and demonstrational of the possibilities of making jam and of preserving fruit. If this is realized, I think much of the criticism made will lose its force. Let us see how the criticism is directed.

"In the first place, it is said that the Nilgiris is not the proper place and that fruit cannot be had there. If it is remembered that this is only an experiment and a demonstration, and if we succeed in getting this experiment through to a success, and if the expert there is able to show that the fruits can be preserved, then all the objection will lose its force. When it is remembered that this is a tropical country, it will be seen that we can claim to produce every kind of fruit in this country more than in any other country in the world. I do not know whether my hon. friend, Mr. MacDougall, is aware that there are districts in this province, like Vizagapatam, where thousands and millions of fruits like pine-apples can be had which are now made to rot and are being sold for one anna and one and half annas each."

12-15 p.m.

Mr. A. M. MacDOUGALL :—"May I ask, Sir, if there is any institute in that district?"

Rai Bahadur K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU :—"If my hon. friend will wait for a few minutes, I shall come to that point."

Mr. M. SURYANARAYANA :—"What about mangoes?"

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU :—"I am coming to mangoes also presently."

"Hon. Members are aware that a tin of this pine-apple jam consisting of half of one fruit which is obtained in the Vizagapatam district, is sold at 12 annas or Rs. 1-4-0 each, whereas the cost of the fruit would be one anna or one and a half annas. Now, I want to ask: what is wrong in the Government undertaking this business trying to evolve a system, by experimenting and demonstrating that the fruit of this country can be preserved and sold not merely for use by the people of this country but also for export?"

"Take, again, the case of mangoes. How many millions of mangoes are going to rot, without being put to the proper use? The ordinary mango can be used even 10 or 15 days after of its being plucked from the tree, and the rest will have to go into waste or be dried up. If all these fruits can be preserved, it would be very useful and profitable to the people. This province produces the best fruits, though the *Alphonso* of Bombay is claimed to be the best. I remember when my friend and myself were sitting in the steamer sailing from Bombay, I was told that *Alphonso* was the best fruit in the world. We have fortunately in our province the variety of mango known as *Banganapalli*, and when I sent one such fruit to my friend, he at once withdrew his remark that *Alphonso* was the best fruit in the world. The mango is known from the place *Banganapalli*, which is, I think, in the Ceded districts. We have all these fruits, and we have our Batavia oranges in the Gōdāvari and Kistna districts. How many thousands of them are going to other countries which are using them! The object of this institute is not merely to make jam, though after all the jam of this country is not so much despised by our people as my hon. friends seem to think. It is not despised by the people of this country, for I find that in one year at least a



21st March 1923] [Mr. K. Venkatareddi Nayudu] .

lakh or a lakh and a half of rupees worth of jams have been imported into this province through steamers alone. I do not know how much else came by rail or otherwise. I am not prepared to accept my hon. friend, Mr. Shanmukham Chettiyar's statement that Englishmen go in only for English jams. After all is said and done, the Englishman is a businessman, and if he finds that the jam of this country is as good as imported jam and that it is cheaper—and we are bound to supply it cheaper than the imported article because the latter has to come from a long distance paying freight—, I am hopeful that they will purchase our jam. Apart from that, Sir Frederick Nicholson himself has mentioned that a taste is being cultivated for jams in this country, and I think he is one of those who know what they say. And when he says that a taste is cultivated among Indians for jams, and the time has come when an attempt should be made to supply jams from our own fruits, the force of this argument against the institute must necessarily lose its value.

“It has been pointed out already (and I do not wish to make any great reference to it) that this is an inherited concern. But I may say, it is like so many other legacies not burdened with any obligation, and that this legacy is not what they call in law *Damnosa hereditas*. I cheerfully accept this legacy and what I want is that time must be given to me to see that what is expected of this concern is realized. It is only three months since the actual work has been begun, and it will be too soon to think of giving up the contract we have entered into. As has been already pointed out, Rs. 7,000 have been invested on the enterprise and if we are to sell the concern now, everybody may expect to take it for a song. When people know that the institute is going to be abolished, we cannot get a fair price for the article. When it becomes a success we can remove the institute to other parts of the country where fruits are available in greater abundance. For instance, we can carry on experiments in the Vizagapatam district where we have good mangoes and pine apples available at a cheap price. Therefore, Sir, I cannot agree to this motion.”

The motion was put and negatived.

#### MOTION No. 186.

Mr. A. M. MacDOUGALL:—“Sir, I move the following motion which stands in my name:

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 20,000 for other contingencies under Industrial Laboratory, Washermanpet, by Rs. 10,000.*

Sir, I simply want some information. In the Budget, on page 188, we find this big item of Rs. 20,000 provided for ‘other contingencies’; whereas we do not find such amounts in other parts of the Budget. I am afraid it is a rather large figure. I learn that the Industrial Chemist is working at Bangalore. When there is a laboratory here, what is the necessity for sending a special establishment to Bangalore?”

Mr. E. F. THOMAS:—“Sir, there is no laboratory at present. The name ‘Industrial Laboratory’ is the name given in anticipation of the building of a laboratory, for which we could not find money. The provision made is in connexion with some operations we are carrying on with regard to the manufacture of ink. I am not quite sure whether it was at the instance of Sir Frederick Nicholson, but one of his scholars was taught in the institute to help him in making very good ink, which is a pretty useful article. We

[Mr. E. F. Thomas]

[21st March 1923]

have very large orders from the Government departments for ink, and we hope to popularise Swadeshi ink among the public. The grant under this head is very small, and most of this amount of Rs. 20,000 is required for raw material. Besides that, there is provision made under this head for experiments which I am asking the Government to sanction to be carried out in making another article of domestic consumption, namely, vinegar by a process which is being developed at Bangalore at the Tata Institute, by a Madras scholar. The Industrial Chemist is working at Bangalore in the Tata Institute of Science by the courtesy of the authorities of that institute. We have not been able, for financial reasons, to supply him with a laboratory in Madras. The provision in the Budget relates to his pay, and the pay, I think, of a peon and possibly of a clerk. He is provided with facilities for work by the Tata Institute of Science and my department is under a very great debt of obligation to that institute for the facilities its authorities have provided. I hope the hon. mover will be satisfied with this information."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

#### MOTION No. 187.

Mr. A. M. MACDOUGALL :—"Sir, I beg to move that—

*the allotment of Rs. 5,000 for Pallapalayam sugar factory be omitted.*

My reason for doing so is this. When I was sitting in the Finance Committee, at the time this scheme came up for review, I was told by one of the hon. Members that this sugar factory was kept open because they found no use for the machinery, and that Rs. 5,000 were required for addition to the machinery. But since then, I have received the report of the Director of Industries for the year 1921. In that report, in the paragraph relating to this sugar factory, it is said as follows:

It cannot be claimed up to the present the experiment has been a success. Indeed in most of the seasons, the factory appears to have worked at an actual loss.

At the end of the last paragraph, we find :

Proposals have therefore been submitted to the Government for the installation of a five-roller mill to improve the percentage of extraction. It is anticipated that the five-roller mill should give an extraction of about 75 per cent as compared with 66 per cent with the existing mill.

"I should like to know from the hon. the Minister in charge if this new five-roller has been obtained, and if his next report regarding the Pallapalayam sugar factory is likely to be more pleasant reading than the present one."

Mr. E. F. THOMAS :—"Mr. President, I do not know which report my hon. friend is referring to. But I have in my hand the report for the year 1922, for the year ending 31st March 1922."

Mr. A. M. MACDOUGALL :—"I quoted from the report for 1921."

Mr. E. F. THOMAS :—"The report for the succeeding year is really very satisfactory. In fact, after making all possible deductions for interest and so forth, a clear profit of a thousand rupees has been made. The five-roller mill has been used, and at present it is working on loan to an agricultural co-operative society—I am not quite certain about the name of the place—I am told it is Kalladaikurichi. We are running it for the people of the Kalladaikurichi co-operative society and they bear all expenses. Probably the society anticipates making a profit by their operations. They may want



21st March 1923]

[E. F. Thomas]

to buy this machine, but we have to take it to Pallapalayam and work it there during the season which begins about August, that is, after the Kalladaikurichi season ends. As a matter of fact, I asked the Government for a better engine so as to produce better results, but I was disappointed. But these operations have passed the experimental stage, since they have been transferred from the Department of Agriculture. I hope the hon. mover is satisfied with the information."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

## MOTION No. 188.

Mr. M. RATNASWAMI :— " Sir, I move—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 17.74 lakhs for Industries by Rs. 43,000.*

My object in moving this reduction is to elicit some information from the hon. the Minister about the toy-making industry. This money is wanted for the importation of machinery in order to make toys by means of machinery. I think, Sir, that the toy-making industry may best be left as it is in the hands of poor people to enable them to eke out their livelihood. For a number of years we have been complaining against the carrying on of so many of our industries by the East India Company and the importation of machinery from the west. Here is a native industry, a cottage industry, which is a source of livelihood for a number of poor people who will otherwise not be able to earn their livelihood. Again, Sir, these toys of ours are much more artistic than the cheap and nasty goods imported from Germany for instance. Therefore, in the interests of art and in the interests of the native industry, I object to the allotment of the sum for the importation of machinery for the making of toys."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU :—" Mr. President, my hon. friend need not be under any apprehension that the machinery are intended to replace the cottage industry. As a matter of fact, Mr. Birdwood who was responsible for the scheme has definitely stated that it is intended to assist the domestic industry. The machinery that is proposed to be imported is not going to be got down on a large scale. It is going to be got down on a small scale so that one or two houses may combine and get the machinery themselves and produce the toys in a scientific manner. It is certainly not the intention to start a big factory or anything of that kind. If my hon. friend likes me to read the passage from the report, certainly I shall do so. But he may take it that the object of the allotment is to develop the cottage industry."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

## MOTION No. 189.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" Sir, I beg to move—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 17.74 lakhs for Industries by Rs. 100.*

I wish to elicit information in regard to certain points connected with the Fisheries Department. This department was originally in charge of the great man, Sir Frederick Nicholson, and he was doing yeoman work for a nominal allowance of Rs. 250 a month,

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar] [21st March 1923]

I think the Department is sufficiently well-organized now and placed on a satisfactory footing ; so much so, I would like to ask the hon. the Minister whether it is necessary to have a Director on a high pay.

"The second thing I want to know is whether the right of collecting fees at the Marine Aquarium cannot be leased out to some private agency as is done in the case of the Zoo by the Madras Corporation. If that is done, much of the establishment that is now stationed there may be done away with.

"The third point that I wish to raise relates to the Chank and Pearl Fisheries. I understand that in Travancore and Ceylon they are leased out and the lessees pay a royalty for the quantity they collect from the bed. I wish to know whether a similar practice cannot be introduced in regard to our pearl and chank fisheries.

"Lastly, Sir, there is said to be a pearl farm in the Kushadi islands. I understand it was sanctioned some years ago, but since no work was done there, it has been practically abandoned. I am told that the establishment there still continues. I want to know whether it is a fact."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU :—"Mr. President, so far as the first suggestion of the hon. Member is concerned, I think it would be unnecessary to put forward any argument. My hon. friend does not want a Director of Industries."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"I meant the Director of Fisheries, Sir. I am of opinion that the Senior Assistant Director may be asked to attend to the work now done by the Director."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU :—"Then, Sir, I may point out that the present Director continues in his post till September or November of this year. After that, what my hon. friend must have been thinking of, namely, the possibility of appointing in his place any of the subordinates, will be taken up.

"As regards the licensing out of the Marine Aquarium, I am afraid, Sir, that it is not possible for the reason that the fish there require careful handling and an establishment of persons who know something about their life history is quite necessary. The Aquarium has been showing very good profits as the hon. Member must be aware.

"Then about the Pearl and Chank Fisheries : My hon. friend would have them leased out. But if he examines the figures relating to the income from the Fisheries Department before the Government took charge of it and after, he will notice that the income has very much increased after the Department was taken over by Government. Leasing will certainly get us some money, but certainly not so much as we are able to make at present. The hon. Member is probably aware that, except in one or two years, the Fisheries Department has been self-supporting.

"Lastly, about the Kushadi islands : Unfortunately, my hon. friend did not bring it to my notice early. I shall certainly try to look into it and see what can be done."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—"Sir, the hon. Member, Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, has already expressed his intention not to have a Director of Fisheries." To me, it seems, Sir, that we have too many Directors



21st March 1923] [Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo]

under the hon. the Minister for Development. I believe the House will have no objection to have one Director to look after all the different branches of industries organized and administered by the Minister. We have now a Director of Fisheries, a Director of Agriculture and a Director of Industries. I believe, of these two are Indian Civil Service men."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU :—"Only one."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—"I am glad of it. I do not know why the Government have not made up their minds to accept the recommendation of the Industrial Commission and put an Industrial expert at the head of the Department. I believe it was two years back that, while discussing the first Budget, this Council brought this question to the notice of the hon. the Minister who was good enough to say that he would give the subject due consideration.

"Secondly, Sir, it is high time for the hon. the Minister to think of giving opportunities to Indians in the Department. I believe the Department of Fisheries has got an Assistant Director and other officials who can be put in charge of the Department. I was further told that a gentleman was sent to England at the cost of this Government and was given very good training in the Department. In these circumstances, Sir, I believe the present gentleman, who has already completed his 55th year and is granted extension for three more years, can be replaced by his Assistant with some allowance. Again, Sir, the Department of Industries may be reorganized and placed under an Industrial expert instead of an Indian Civil Service gentleman. I believe, Sir, the Civil Service gentlemen are placed at the head of any Department as necessity arises."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU :—"I cannot accept the suggestion to dispense with my Directors. The suggestion is that all the three Directors might be moulded into one. That is a feat, Sir, which I cannot accomplish. The Agricultural Department is already over-worked, and we are finding it difficult to decentralize some work and release him of a certain portion of his responsibility. As for the Director of Industries, the appointment is quite recent. The Department itself is a new one and we have got so much to develop. We have to work the State Aid to Industries Act."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—"Sir, I believe the Act has to be worked by the Committee appointed under it and not by the Director."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU :—"Yes. But there must be some one to guide the Committee. The President of the Committee is the Director of Industries. That appointment must be there. Regarding Fisheries, my hon. friend raised the objection that I had granted an extension to the present gentleman. The reason for my doing so is this. It was found recently that some pearls' fat was available in the sea and we are expecting to have a good deal of pearls. I take this opportunity to mention to the House that our fishery revenue has been considerably increased and there is no one else in the Presidency who knows pearl fishing. That was why the extension was given. As regards the appointment of an Indian, my hon. friend was referring to the gentleman who was sent to England. No doubt he is an able man, but he must come to us before we appoint him. He is expected only in September."

[21st March 1923]

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" I have nothing much to say except that I know that the Marine Aquarium is giving us some money as profits. But that is no reason why we should be spending up to the limit we are getting from that institution. Now, there is a Sub-Assistant on Rs. 125-240, four keepers and three servants. I thought, Sir, that some reduction was possible."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU :—" Regarding that Sub-Assistant, Sir, I may say that he does other work also."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" I dare say that the question will be considered by the Minister, and I do not want to take up the time of the House. I withdraw my motion, Sir."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Demand XXIV—Industries—for a sum not exceeding 17.74 lakhs was put and carried and the grant was made.

#### DEMAND XXV—LABOUR INCLUDING FACTORIES.

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—" Sir, I beg to move that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding 9.59 lakhs under Demand XXV. Labour, including factories."

#### MOTION No. 190.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" I beg to move—

*To omit the allotment of Rs. 9,840 for Chief Inspector of Factories.*

In view of the fact, Sir, that this question was fully discussed last year, and in view of the, may I say, deluge which will sweep away all important subjects we have to deal with this evening, I will be very brief in my remarks. Of course, Sir, some on the other side may be interested in our going on with this discussion so that important subjects may not be taken up (laughter). But it is with the view that such subjects should not be left undiscussed for want of time, that I propose to be brief. I would, if necessary, reserve many of my remarks for my reply at the end.

" So far as this motion is concerned, there will not be much difficulty in taking away this officer. There are two Departments, that of the Boilers and that of the Factories. The Industrial Commission recommended that these might be Transferred Subjects controlled by the Minister for Industries. That is found impossible to be followed by this Government. But I should like to know why these two allied subjects should be in the hands of two separate Members of the Executive Council. They can be placed in charge of one Member, and in my opinion both the departments may be placed directly in charge of the Labour Department.

" I think, Sir, the boilers are as much concerned with labour as the factory and it is therefore necessary and desirable that the Department of Boilers should be placed under the Labour Commissioner. If this is done, there will be no necessity for this Chief Inspector of Factories. I believe the Chief Inspector has also some original jurisdiction. There are only 800 or 900 factories, and probably their number may increase in the near future. We have already a sufficiently large number of Inspectors of

12-45 p.m.



21st March 1923] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

Factories, and, therefore, this particular Chief Inspector is not necessary. The Chief Inspector has some original jurisdiction, and he has to inspect a much smaller number of factories than the ordinary inspectors. What is more, he has got an Assistant Inspector on Rs. 300 to assist him. Much has been said before about the qualifications of the Factory Inspectors, and I do not want to weary the House by going into the question again. Whatever may be the qualifications that are required on paper, so far as this particular Chief Inspector is concerned, we have not heard much about his qualifications excepting the fact that he was once a sanitary inspector. We also know that from what has been already published there are some others who are better qualified than this individual. If the post of Chief Inspector is abolished, all of them may be placed on an equal position, and all of them may correspond to the Commissioner of Labour who is above them. In this way, I submit there is absolutely no necessity for a Chief Inspector of Factories.

"There is another important point to which I wish to draw the attention of the House, and that is, the necessity for amalgamating these two departments. Much was said last year about this. There is absolutely no reason why we should not follow in this respect the industrially more advanced province of Bombay. In that province both the departments are amalgamated and nothing has been said either by the Government or the non-official agency in that province that this has worked considerable hardship among the public. Perhaps my hon. friend, the Home Member, might quote the opinion of the Collector of Bombay who said that it would be better if there were two Inspectors separately for each. But he did not say that there should be two separate Chief Inspectors. Anyhow, hon. Members of the House are convinced that these two departments should be coupled together. Both of them are practically doing the same work, and so far as the Inspectors of Factories are concerned, they can be easily amalgamated. There will be plenty of savings in the number of persons employed, as well as the travelling allowance drawn by these officers. I know it will be said that the Factory Inspector examines the factories when the boiler is hot, and the Boiler Inspector examines them when the boiler is cool. All I can say is that the Factory Inspector has as much to do with the boiler as the Boiler Inspector. In places where there are a number of factories, the Factory Inspector may first examine whether the factory is in order and then he may examine all the factories again when the boiler is cool. The Factory Inspector may take a long trip and examine the factories first on his way to the particular places, and then again on his return he can examine the boilers. In any case there can be no doubt that if these two departments are amalgamated, the work will be done much better. The factories themselves will welcome this proposal because they would be relieved of the necessity of attending to the convenience of two sets of officers. There will be one qualified person who will attend to all the difficulties. This proposal will save a good deal of establishment and correspondence charges and also travelling allowances. I submit, Sir, that our request is a very modest one. All I can say is that so far as the Chief Inspector is concerned, if his post is taken away, the heavens will not fall but the work will be attended to much better than it is done at present. I therefore request the House to vote for the abolition of the post of Chief Inspector."

[21st March 1923]

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—" Sir, before I enter into the details of my hon. friend's arguments I should like to refer to one preliminary point. It will be observed that my hon. friend proposes the omission of the allotment of Rs. 9,840 for the Chief Inspector of Factories. This allotment covers the salary of the Chief Inspector for the whole year. That is to say, speaking on the 21st March, my hon. friend proposes that we should not only get rid of this officer from the 1st April, but that we should refuse him his pay for March which falls due on the 1st April. I wish to enter my emphatic protest against this proposal. When I took charge of my present portfolio last April, I found myself in connexion with this very Department in an absolutely impossible position. I found that by a vote taken at the end of March the organization of the Labour Department had been entirely upset and disorganized as a result of which we were not able to make any progress for nearly a month. My suggestion is that in similar cases if the House really make up their mind that a particular officer is not wanted, they may at least allow this amount of consideration to the Government, namely, that instead of suggesting that the department should be summarily disorganized within seven days of the vote, they may lay down that the reduction should take place later on. In other words, a more reasonable method of proposing reduction would be to omit the provision, say, for ten months out of twelve months. I submit, Sir, it is not fair to any executive Government to ask them at seven days' notice to face such an entire disorganization of their whole executive machinery as my hon. friend's proposal if taken literally would amount to.

"I gather that one of the points to which my hon. friend attaches importance is that the Boiler Inspector and the Factory Inspector should be under the same member of the Government. That, Sir, is a matter for His Excellency the Governor; it is hardly a matter which I can usefully discuss here.

"I come to the other point, namely, the suggestion that the Boiler Department and the Department of Inspector of Factories should be amalgamated. As pointed out by my hon. friend, this matter was discussed at very great length last year and ended in the suggestion that it deserved the careful attention of the Finance Committee. The Finance Committee has not yet come to any conclusion because the subject has not yet been before it. What actually happened was that several months in the year were taken up in the discussion of certain comments raised on the working of the Boiler Department by the Accountant-General. I have not full details, but I gather that the Accountant-General passed some strictures in regard to travelling allowance and other matters and that led to an acrimonious discussion. At any rate, by the time the matter came to us the Retrenchment Committee had been appointed and it was decided that the more satisfactory course would be to lay that matter before the Retrenchment Committee and not before the Finance Committee. That is where the matter stands now.

"I confess, Sir, I see a great deal of attraction in the suggestion that these two departments should be amalgamated. In that I am only following the example of the hon. the Finance Member who last year mentioned to the House that he at one time thought there might be some saving and had as a matter of fact, in a different capacity sent up proposals for this amalgamation,



21st March 1923]

[Mr. A. R. Knapp]

But I should like to call the attention of the House to the conclusion of his remarks on the occasion of last year's debate. He said :

Is the amalgamation a business proposition? That is really the only question. I quite realize that it looks as if there is some saving in it. At one time I thought there was a saving in it myself. I did my best to get that saving. I have satisfied myself that there was no means of effecting a saving unless we restrict our inspections which under the law we cannot do.

"It is not however merely a question of saving. I would like the House to understand that so far as the factory staff is concerned, its only object is to further the interests of the labourers employed in the factories. They are to be there to see that the labourers are treated with proper consideration, that they are screened from danger, that their health is properly attended to and that young children are not improperly employed and that the hours of working are not exceeded. I do not think it is the desire of the House that the Government should now withdraw from or relax that supervision which they have been exercising on behalf of the labourers, merely for the sake of the small economy which my hon. friend indicates. On the contrary, I think I shall have the House with me when I say that so far from relaxing supervision by abolishing these Factory Inspectors, we should do everything in our power to see that the rules laid down in the Act for the benefit of the labourers are more and more strictly enforced.

"My hon. friend referred to the example of Bombay, and suggested that we should follow that. I am quite prepared to do so because the latest information that we have is that the experiment in Bombay is a failure and that they propose to revert to the old system of having two separate departments. I am quite prepared to accept this challenge : if that satisfies my hon. friend I presume he will not press his motion.

"Then, Sir, on the question of the particular appointment of Chief Inspector, my hon. friend suggests that we can do away with him. The implication is that there is hardly enough work for him to do. Whatever might have been the case when we discussed this item last year, the position has considerably changed within the last six months. The Indian Factories Act has been amended and the number of factories has very largely increased. There were something like 500 factories before, and they have increased to 850 ; and within the course of the next few months we can expect them to increase to 1,200. The House will have to remember that all these factories have to be inspected by the Inspectors. The establishment found necessary for 500 factories can hardly be regarded as excessive when the number of factories to be inspected rises to 1,200. The Chief Inspector of Factories has his own area to inspect. He is stationed in Madras and the factories allotted to him for inspection are among the most important in the Presidency. He has at present to inspect 109 factories, but with the increase in the total number of factories, it is likely that his charge will be very largely added to. Apart from the suggestion that this particular officer has not got sufficient work, I take it that my hon. friend proposes to reduce the total number of Inspectors by one. With four Inspectors and with an area of 35,000 square miles to inspect, each Inspector is called upon to inspect nearly 300 factories and this is as much as he can attend to if he is going to do his work properly. I am not sure whether any economy would be effected by coupling the duties of the Factory Inspector and the Boiler Inspector. It was pointed out last year that the qualifications for the two kinds of Inspectors were quite different. For the Boiler Inspector, a man trained in marine boiler work is necessary

[Mr. A. R. Knapp]

[21st March 1923]

while the Factory Inspector need not be a mechanic at all. It is possible of course that the Factory Inspector might be taught the work of a Mechanical Engineer and *vice versa*. But for immediate practical purposes, I should like to point out that if the two Departments are amalgamated at once we have to get rid of the whole staff except one person. There is at present only one person who is qualified to carry out both duties. I doubt very much whether my hon. friend wishes us to take such a step.

"It is quite true as pointed out by my hon. friend, Mr. MacDougall, this morning, that we can break over contracts 'at a price.' I personally think it unlikely that the House will be willing merely on the matter of sentiment to pay the price involved in discharging the whole of the two staffs in order that we might engage a new combined. The matter as I have already pointed out is under the consideration of the Retrenchment Committee. If they suggest an economical and at the same time a satisfactory method of amalgamation, I have not the slightest objection to adopt their proposals. Till they do that, I think I am entitled to claim that the House should provide me with enough money to carry on the department of factories in such a manner as will not only fulfil the requirements of the existing law but will save us from having to relax in any way the supervision which we are carrying on for the benefit of the labourers of the Presidency."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"I have a few words to say, Sir. The Government propose their Budget grants at the end of the year and they include this particular grant at the end of the Budget. Therefore, we are not to blame in the matter, whereas the Government are to blame for not having fulfilled their undertaking. There were a large number of speakers on this question of abolition last year and the motion was withdrawn then on the understanding that the matter will be put before the Finance Committee. That was not done owing to some sort of family quarrel between the Accountant-General and the Government. As regards the working of this Department in Bombay, I think it would be good to follow the present example of Bombay, and if Bombay changes her system afterwards, I think we will have time enough to think of it. Besides Bombay there are also other provinces which have amalgamated these Departments. My hon. friend while understanding me unintentionally misrepresents me. He asked what would be the fate of some of these officers if the departments were amalgamated. I never made any motion for deleting the whole charge on this establishment. My motion was simply for the omission of the allotment for this one officer. The hon. Member quoted the instance of the Land Records Department."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"Sir, I referred to the Labour Department which the House was pleased to break up last March."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"The hon. Member might remember, Sir, that the Land Records Department also was practically set at naught and yet we had something to provide by way of supplementary demands for one month's pay to the officer. The demand for this Department is so large that the hon. Member can certainly spare at least a few hundreds to give this gentleman pay for two months. All those are technicalities. But so far as qualifications are concerned, I suppose Indians are quite capable of acquiring factory as well as boiler qualifications. I do



21st March 1923] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

not want to go into the history of these officers, but it is a fact that many of these gentlemen had training only for four months in the Perambur factory. The same sort of training can easily be given to all the officers. The matter was fully gone into last year. There is a question of principle involved in this, and all that I say is that this gentleman has got an assistant who will be able to do the work of one Inspector if this officer goes away."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"Am I to understand, Sir, that my hon. friend proposes to abolish these two officers, the Chief Inspector and his assistant?"

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"I want only the Chief Inspector to go away so that the other gentleman can be put in charge of the Department. Even if there is an increase in the number of factories, there will be no difficulty at all even if this gentleman is asked to go away. From 500 the factories may go up to 1,000 and yet, I think, the work can be done by the assistant. So I certainly press for the abolition of this post."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"When I referred to the difficulty in making arrangements to meet a cut from the 1st of April, I was making a general remark and I meant it to apply, as it does apply, to all the cuts made in this Council. My suggestion is that the reduction suggested should perhaps be ten months' pay. I understand my hon. friend's proposal to be that we should abolish the Chief Inspector, raise the assistant inspector to the status of an inspector and leave four men to carry out the work. A re-organization of that kind, even if it were possible, will take some time to effect. I am not quite sure exactly what merits my hon. friend claims in support of his proposal. The only indication that I have had—and I am sorry to say it—was that there was a racial suggestion at the bottom of it."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"There is absolutely nothing racial at all, Sir. We know that most of them are Anglo-Indians. I have always looked upon them as my brethren and I am sorry that when my speech was so full of arguments, the hon. Member should suspect that there is something racial in it."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"I am glad to hear my hon. friend say that. I thought I heard him say something about the personality of the Chief Inspector . . ."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"Because he is inferior in qualifications."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"If it was not racial, I am glad to hear it. My hon. friend has given no reason, except the suggestion that this gentleman is not qualified, for proposing that we should do away with him. I protest that it is not possible to expect a Department to carry on if with a seven days' notice you are going to destroy its organization and leave it for some time at any rate, to run without supervision. As I have already said, the Retrenchment Committee has taken the matter in hand and I would suggest to the House that the wisest course would be to leave it to them sitting round a table to examine the matter in all its details, to advise us as to whether amalgamation is possible or not, and whether any reduction in the staff of this department is or is not advisable."

[21st March 1923]

The motion was put to the House and declared lost. Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar demanded a poll which was taken with the following result:—

*Ayes.*

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. Rao Sahib S. Ellappa Chettiyar       | 19. Diwan Bahadur K. Suryanarayanamurti Nayudu. |
| 2. Rao Bahadur P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu. | 20. Mr. A. Tangavelu Nayagar.                   |
| 3. " T. Balaji Rao Nayudu.              | 21. " V. C. Vellingiri Goundar.                 |
| 4. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar.     | 22. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu.      |
| 5. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar.      | 23. Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar.           |
| 6. Rao Bahadur K. Gopalakrishnaaya.     | 24. " M. Suryanarayana.                         |
| 7. Mr. K. P. Gopala Menon.              | 25. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo.              |
| 8. " K. A. Kandaswami Kandar.           | 26. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhacharlu.          |
| 9. " J. Kuppuswami.                     | 27. Sriman Sasibhushan Rath Mahasayo.           |
| 10. " B. Muniewami Nayudu.              | 28. Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar.                  |
| 11. " A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chettiyar. | 29. " S. Arpudaswami Udayar.                    |
| 12. " V. P. Pakkiriswami Pillai.        | 30. " A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.                  |
| 13. " P. T. Rajan.                      | 31. " K. Prabhakaran Tampam.                    |
| 14. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Punja.       | 32. Khan Sahib Saiyid Ibrahim Ravuttar.         |
| 15. Mr. W. P. A. Saundarapandiya Nadar. | 33. Ahmad Miran Sahib Bahadur.                  |
| 16. " R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar.       |   |
| 17. " K. Sitarama Reddi.                |   |
| 18. " Somaesundara Mudaliyar.           |   |

*Noes.*

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter.                         | 17. Mr. S. Muttumanikkachari.                           |
| 2. " Khan Bahadur Sir Mhhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur. | 18. Rev. W. Meston.                                     |
| 3. " the Raja of Panagal.                                  | 19. The Raja of Ramnad.                                 |
| 4. " Bai Bahadur K. Venkatarreddi Nayudu.                  | 20. Mr. C. R. T. Congreve.                              |
| 5. " Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro.                              | 21. Abbas Ali Khan Bahadur.                             |
| 6. " Mr. A. R. Knapp.                                      | 22. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Sadulla Badsha Sahib Bahadur. |
| 7. " Mr. C. P. Ramaaswami Ayyar.                           | 23. Haji Abdullah Sahib.                                |
| 8. Mr. E. S. Lloyd.  | 24. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur.          |
| 9. " A. Y. G. Campbell.                                    | 25. Rao Bahadur M. C. Raja.                             |
| 10. " R. D. Richmond.                                      | 26. Mr. L. C. Guruswami.                                |
| 11. Rao Bahadur T. M. Sivagnanam Pillai.                   | 27. Rao Sahib P. Venkatarangayya.                       |
| 12. Mr. E. F. Thomas.                                      | 28. Mr. A. J. Leech.                                    |
| 13. " E. Periyanaayakam.                                   | 29. " A. M. MacDougall.                                 |
| 14. Rao Sahib T. C. Tangavelu Pillai.                      | 30. Rao Bahadur T. Namburumal Chettiyar.                |
| 15. Mr. A. Ramaaswami Mudaliyar.                           | 31. A. E. Rencontre.                                    |
| 16. " S. T. Shanmukham Pillai.                             |   |

The motion was carried, 33 voting *for* and 31 *against*.

## MOTION No. 191.

1-15 p.m.

Khan Sahib SAIYID IBRAHIM RAVUTTAR :—" Sir, I beg to move the motion that stands in my name—

*To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,000 for the Assistant Inspector of Factories.*

My object in tabling this motion is only to elicit information as to why provision is made for a new post like this."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—" Sir, seeing that the Chief Inspector of Factories has disappeared, I should have thought a discussion on this motion would not arise. Anyhow, my answer to the hon. mover is this: as explained in the discussion on the last motion, owing to the amendment of the Factories Act, the work to be done by these Factory Inspectors has more than doubled. This, I think, is a sufficient explanation for the very modest addition to the staff that is asked for. If it is the pleasure of the House that in future our labourers should not be looked after, it is their responsibility and not mine. I must however express my surprise that any



21st March 1923]

[Mr. A. R. Knapp]

members of this House should desire to cut down the provision made for the purpose of ensuring the security and good treatment of the labourers in this Presidency."

Mr. A. M. MACDOUGALL :—"The reason why I stand up now is to express my disappointment at the attitude of the House on the last motion."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"Sir, I rise to a point of order. Is it open to any member to find fault with the vote of the House either directly or indirectly and is not my hon. friend's expression of disappointment at the attitude of the Council, out of order?"

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—"Mr. MacDougall is only just prefacing his speech."

Mr. A. M. MACDOUGALL :—"I am giving reasons for speaking like that. I do not know whether this House is quite aware of the duties of the Factory Inspector. I take it that the impression left in the minds of hon. Members of this House is that they are friends of the labourers, friends of the poor and men who are standing up for the rights of the people. Now, factory inspection is admitted as a necessity in every civilized country. India from her place in the International Council of Labour at Washington demanded labour legislation and I am surprised that anyone in this House should stand against the opportunity of having labour inspection in Madras. As a factory owner myself, I know the need for a factory inspector. The recent legislation has widened the labours of the factory inspector by increasing the number of small factories very largely. Factories consisting of ten or more workmen have now come under this legislation and all these have to be inspected. It is not the big factories that need inspection, as much as the small factories consisting of 15 or 20 workmen. In my own experience, when I was going round the factories of Madras one day with my hon. friend the Minister, I saw a boy chained to his work. If such a thing had happened in a large factory, a cry would have been raised about that. In a small place practically no notice was taken of it. We have instances where boys are chained down to the bench to get work done. Now, when a boy is chained like this, we have the factory inspector to look to that. So, since the factory inspector's work has been so greatly increased, it is necessary that the staff also should be increased instead of cutting away the grant made for that purpose. I strongly oppose the motion that has been now placed before the House, and I express my regret that I have not spoken before."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

#### MOTION No. 192.

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—"Sir, the motion standing in my name runs thus :—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 8,95,080 for Commissioner of Labour and Industrial Settlements by Rs. 100.*

Mr. President, I am aware of the eagerness of this House to get through the whole work as rapidly as possible so that whatever we might wish to save might be effectively achieved. Nevertheless, while sharing in this eagerness, I venture to ask the permission of the chair for a few minutes, while I seek to draw the attention of the House, their very earnest and sympathetic attention, to what I believe to be a question

[Mr. R. Venkataratnam Nayudu] [21st March 1923]

of prime importance in the evolution of a new and better India. Sir, I think it is necessary that I should state that in undertaking to move this motion it is far from my intention either to cast any aspersions on the Government or to suggest anything like a want of confidence in the hon. the Home Member. My sole object, as I have already stated, is to request the House, if I may, to pause for a few minutes and consider the momentousness of this question of the elevation of the depressed classes. Sir, a well-known journalist has said that the centre of gravity of social advancement in this country has shifted from the question of foreign voyages to the question of the elevation of the depressed classes. Therefore, Sir, I wish to request the House to ponder whether or not we ought to bestow, in view of the almost incalculable magnitude of the subjects, much closer attention and much larger sympathy and consequently much ampler funds than we are now doing, proportionate to this momentous question of national expansion. Sir, I shall here re-call what has recently been stated by one of the worthies, one of the most highly honoured and revered sons, of India at present, I mean Dr. Sir P. C. Ray. Just the other day he said that the treatment which for generations and centuries had been given to the depressed classes was nothing short of a national sin, and unless the nation as a whole strove to avert nemesis by early repentance and ample retribution, we were doomed to be the outcastes of the Empire. It is to this aspect of the question, Sir, that I wish to invite very serious and sympathetic consideration. I should like to utter a word of cordial appreciation and grateful recognition in one respect. The hon. Sir Narayan Ganesh Chandavarkar, at present the President of the Bombay Council, stated on a recent occasion that when he was on a visit to Bangalore an elderly Indian lady, an esteemed member of the family with whom he was put up, pointed out to him the gardener of the house, a member of a depressed class, who, with his daughter, was under caste ex-communication for the double caste offence, namely, of the man having first given some education to his daughter, his only child, with the consequential freedom and then the father and the daughter having declined a match which, according to the caste custom, they were bound to accept. None the less the two had held out, each leaning on the strength of the other and each depending on the confidence of the other. When this instance was mentioned by the old lady to Sir Narayan, the latter observed that truly the work of the Depressed Classes Mission had succeeded. 'Nay,' said the old lady, 'the British rule has told.' I wish to point out that in this one respect, if not in others, the British rule has told; and the conscience of the nation and the consciousness of the depressed classes have been awakened in a manner that challenges regard on all sides. For this service we cannot be sufficiently thankful to the British rule. One of the noblest sons of Great Britain that ever came to serve in this country—I mean Lord Metcalfe—said more than a century ago :

This world is governed by an Invisible Power which giveth and taketh away dominion. All that human rulers could do is to deserve the dominion by furthering the happiness of those who are placed under their care.

"Judging by that criterion and directing our attention particularly to what has been done by way of an honest and strenuous attempt to elevate the depressed classes, I say judging by that criterion it must be owned that at the hands of that Invisible Power the British nation has deserved dominion in India. Having said that, I desire, at the same time, to note, that



21st March 1923] [Mr. R. Venkataratnam Nayudu]

if there has been on the one side strenuous effort for the elevation of the depressed classes on the part of the representatives of the British administration, there has been not wanting most cordial and grateful appreciation of that good work on the side of those who have been best benefited by it. Speaking at a public meeting of his community some time back, my hon. friend, Rao Bahadur M. C. Raja, said that members of his community had fought and shed their blood on behalf of the establishment of the British rule and that they would similarly fight and shed their blood to resist every ill-considered and misguided movement to disturb that position or to shake the foundations of that rule. This healthy and happy relation of mutual regard and mutual trust has been established between the rulers and those who have been benefited by that rule; and we all wish that grace may be granted for the uninterrupted continuation of that relation.

“ Sir, as we appreciate this, let us, as we seek to remove the bureaucratic methods which we never miss an opportunity to condemn, recognise that there has been this redeeming feature in the bureaucratic Government which it is our bounden duty to carry into the democratic system with which we wish to replace the old order of things; for if there is one thing which should be borne in mind more than another, it is sedulously to combat the forces that stand in the way of ameliorating the depressed classes. As I make this general observation, I have particularly in mind this special consideration, that in dealing with this question of the amelioration of the depressed classes, it will not do to cling to what we regard to be the *general* principles of administration. Rules should be modified and standards should be moderated, and a considerable amount of what we would call differential treatment should be accorded, if this work was to succeed. Therefore, it will be wrong to urge that methods which we in general have accepted with reference to the other branches of the administration shall apply here also. It will not do, for instance, to contend, if it be pleaded that the depressed classes are hopelessly poor, that there are also poor members in other communities. I venture to submit that there is a radical distinction between there being poor members in well-to-do communities and there being poor *communities*, who are hopeless in their economic condition. There is no community that does not contain some poor members. The mercantile community has certainly some paupers, and the land holding community has surely some that are utterly bankrupt. That does not argue, nobody therefore says, that the land-holding and the mercantile community are poor. Though there may be some members not in well-to-do circumstances, the community is not in such pitiable condition of abject poverty as the depressed classes. A poet has avowed—‘ Slow rises worth by poverty depressed ’ Shall I say in this country there is no poverty so depressing as the poverty of caste? It is this poverty of caste that has been condemning to the lowest depths of degradation the so-called depressed classes. How to lift them to that position which is their due? How shall we redeem the moral, the national debt that we owe to them? That is the supreme problem to-day I venture to submit that it is not one Mr. Paddison, it is not one Mr. Knapp, it is not this one department or that other department, but every department and each one of us who has some power, some occasion for exercising patronage, ought to feel it a duty to do all that is possible to uplift these depressed classes. What is the magnitude of the task that has to be accomplished? If we remember that

[Mr. R. Venkataratnam Nayudu] [21st March 1923]

these depressed classes number over 65 lakhs, one-fifth of the total population of the Madras Presidency, and if we again realize that, unlike the department of sanitation, health and vital statistics—which we were told would test whether we are fit for Swaraj—this department is to ameliorate the whole life of the depressed classes, not merely their health and sanitation, but also their education, their social emancipation, their civic recognition and their religious elevation. If we recognize the extent to which this work is to be carried, certainly we shall see that we, as a nation, in whose hands any power has been placed, upon whose shoulders any responsibility has been reposed, we all owe a duty to these depressed classes. I therefore repeat that this must be treated as a national concern and not merely as a subject that concerns this one department or that."

At this stage (1-38 p.m.) the House adjourned for lunch, and re-assembled at 2-30 p.m. with the hon. the Deputy President in the Chair.

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—" May I remind the House that this is the last day for the discussion of the Budget? Many hon. Members have asked me to proceed so as to reach the more important subjects. All I wish to say is that it is entirely in the hands of the Members of this House."

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—" I am sincerely grateful to you, Sir, for having allowed me to continue my remarks. The hon. the Revenue Member was pleased to refer to my speech a few minutes ago as a fine sermon. Yet, sir, I am as anxious as anybody else that we should proceed to the more important subjects. But I only venture to enter this caveat that there is no subject more important than this. Sir, as we broke up for lunch I was seeking to point out that it was the imperative duty of every head of department, nay, every officer of any position and power, to encourage the employment, in the largest number possible, of members of the depressed classes. If, Sir, inequalities are to be removed from our race, if the old spell is to be lifted from our hearts, if the ring fences of monopoly are to be broken, if the magic circle of superstition is to be effaced, the only remedy lies in placing the members of the depressed classes in posts of position and responsibility where, by their acts and by their example, they will be able to prove that they, too, have got in them the natural capacity to reach the acme of perfection in the long run. Therefore, it is of prime importance that they should be employed in as large numbers as possible. As I have already hinted, in view of the vast numbers concerned, and in view of the wide range of work that has to be done, in my humble opinion—if my humble opinion finds endorsement at the hands of the hon. Member in charge—this department for the elevation of the depressed classes should be a separate department by itself. If in the beginning the financial outlay is large, it will be so only for a limited period of time. For, as the work appeals further to the heart of the people, I am sure there will rise from all communities voluntary workers who will declare, if I may use the well-known language, 'my *dhanam*, my *manam* and my *thanam* all are dedicated to this work'; and I have rendered myself unto this work'. Therefore, Sir, in the employment of workers for this department we should always bear in mind that it is the voluntary work that is going finally to succeed; and this good work will be best achieved if we also remember the proverb, viz., that blood is thicker than water, and employ, to the largest extent possible, workers from the depressed classes themselves.



21st March 1923] [Mr. R. Venkataratnam Nayudu]

"Only one final appeal I wish to make; and I request that I might be permitted to do it. When the non-Brahman movement, after stirring under the surface for some time, came into view, a distinction was made very early between the pro-Brahman non-Brahman and the pure non-Brahman; and I wish to observe that in every progressive movement there will be these two types of persons, viz., the subdued souls and the ardent spirits. The subdued souls will be mealy-mouthed to the others, even as the ardent souls are to the former class the vixen-tongued. We should put up with these differences. Let it not be said of those of the so-called higher caste that they have fomented such difference between the members of the depressed classes, that they have employed some of these people to their own advantage, as it was said, I do not know with what justice, that when the distinction was made between the pro-Brahman non-Brahman and the non-Brahman proper, the Brahman used the pro-Brahman non-Brahman as his own instrument for pitting one section against another. I hope there will be no such unfortunate situation; but we shall pledge ourselves, despite all differences, to step forward and devote ourselves to this work of the elevation of the depressed classes. Sir, in this connexion I am reminded of a great saying of that world-renowned teacher of practical morals—Sadi, the author of *Gulistan*:—'Wouldst thou conceive the plight of an ant under thy feet, imagine thine own plight under the feet of an elephant.' It is that imagination that we will have to exercise, that imagination which will beget in us the higher clarity of which it was said that it would not only give but also forgive. Let us proceed on this principle. Then alone shall we render justice to these depressed classes

"One last word, Sir, and I have done. During the early period of that noble quest which led to the *Maha Nirvana*, the final emancipation, it is said that Prince Sidhartha, when returning, a certain evening, from a visit to an Asramam on a hill top, fell among a flock of sheep wherein he found this pathetic spectacle. There were two lambs, one strong and sound of limb capering ahead from boulder to boulder with the other lambs, and the other, weak and crippled and lagging behind, in momentary danger of being lost sight of altogether. The poor mother, divided between these two young ones, was now rushing forth to meet the healthy lamb and again hastening back to see whether it might enable the crippling one to keep pace. Sir, at this juncture, as Sidhartha noted this moving sight, he lifted the crippled lamb and said: 'Mother, thy heart has been divided between the two young ones. I have taken the crippled one in my arms. I will enable it to keep pace with the rest of the flock. Let thy heart be at peace.' The heart of mother India is now similarly divided between the progressive classes and the depressed classes; and I appeal to these and other persons of light and leading to play the part of Sidhartha, lift the depressed classes to their bosoms and address Bharatha Matha, 'let thy heart be at peace; we will take care of them'."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"Sir, I am in general agreement with the views put forward by my hon. friend Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu so far as the question of the elevation of the depressed classes is concerned, that is, so far as the motion pertaining to the Department of Labour. If I rise, it is because I want to make a few remarks about the criminal and industrial settlements, which form part of this resolution. Though there was a motion of mine for the reduction of Rs. 20,000, I

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu] [21st March 1923]

thought it better to raise that question generally at this stage. I may inform the House that the reclamation work which has been undertaken by Government for reclaiming the criminal tribes is a work which everyone will appreciate and will receive with great gratification. I must also express our gratitude to those mission and other agencies which have been at work for carrying out this reclamation of the criminal tribes. While expressing high appreciation of the object of Government and of the efforts made by the mission and other agencies in carrying out this object, I believe it is my duty, with the intimate knowledge I have of the working of at least one of the important industrial settlements at Kavali, to place before this House certain aspects for discussion. I may point out that when the settlement was started, people in the vicinity were naturally afraid of the presence of these persons because there was an increase of crime in the vicinity. Although there was a sort of relief in places at distances, it naturally gave alarm and produced considerable havoc in places adjoining the settlement. Especially during the last one or two years it must be admitted that there have been a large number of escapes from the criminal settlements and persons naturally and willingly went to jail rather than live in those criminal settlements. The problem which arose for consideration in this connexion was whether, as a matter of fact, there was anything wrong in the discipline maintained in the settlement or whether it was the economic problem relating to the wages they earned and to the sort of life they were leading. There was also the other question as to whether jail-life was better than life in the criminal settlements.

“ There is not the slightest doubt, Sir, that at a certain stage persons did really feel that they would probably be in a much better position outside the criminal settlement than inside it. This was responsible for the large number of escapes from the criminal settlement. I am one of those non-official visitors of criminal settlements who have been trying to arrive at a solution of this problem. I must state that we have not succeeded so far. It will be found that some inquiries were made, and our ex-Law Member also visited the criminal settlement at Kavali and thought that one of the remedies for the better management of this settlement was to reduce the strength of the settlement. He thought that it was so unmanageable, and that the persons there could not be properly disciplined. It was fairly well known that these proposals were under consideration. I wish to know whether, as a matter of fact, any further steps have been taken by the Government for the purpose of remedying the state of affairs so far as that settlement at Kavali is concerned.

“ Another problem which arises is that unless persons living in a settlement have some means of employment by which they can really have a permanent livelihood they will not be quiet. Temporary make-shifts will not solve the question. I know that several of the settlers in Kavali are employed on road works. A requisition is made by the Manager of the settlement to the presidents of local boards that certain roads should be given to them for work and almost always, some consideration is shown and the Manager is entrusted with road works. But this will not lead them to secure any permanent means of livelihood. This will not help them to get into better modes of living. The problem is to be solved, I submit, without further delay. Various people have been sending reports of a divergent character.



21st March 1923] [Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu]

All that I complain is that nothing has been done as yet either to make their condition better or to improve their character or to bring them under better discipline. I am also informed that even the officers of the Police Department had several difficulties in dealing with them; because some of them had not the same facility for controlling their actions as they had in other places. The Manager of the settlement used to say that without his consent and without his knowledge nothing could be done. His own agents, who were expected to watch the movements of these settlers, were, in his opinion, entitled to certain consideration and it was found difficult to control their actions. On this occasion, I take the opportunity of bringing to the notice of the hon. Member in charge that if these settlements are to do any useful work, if they are to achieve the objects we had in view when establishing these settlements, he must take up at once a reformation of these settlements. As matters stand at present, the public are not satisfied with the way in which things are being done now. I am speaking from personal experience of them. Things are not as desirable as they ought to be. The people are sometimes badly treated. Even we, non-official visitors, have not got any hand in the matter.

"With your permission, I shall give one or two instances as to how things are going on. Once we, three non-official visitors, went round the Kavali settlement. Unfortunately, at the time of the roll-call, all the criminals were gathered at a particular place and an old woman wanted to approach us and make some representations. She merely got up and tried to approach us; she did not even go to us; but, the former Assistant Manager in charge thought this act was a breach of discipline and so had her kept in the lock-up. Again, some of the settlers wanted to make some representations to us, probably about the treatment they were receiving there. They were not allowed to approach us. They stealthily got up some petitions written and presented them to us without being known to the Manager or Assistant Manager in charge. They said 'if it is known to the Manager that we are presenting petitions to you, you do not know how we shall be treated hereafter'. We could not do anything. We sent the petitions to the District Magistrate for such action as he thought fit. We acted merely as a post office. Again, in the course of our inquiry, the former Assistant Manager in charge insisted upon being present with us at every stage. Thus, the settlers could not represent their grievances. We had no opportunity of making an independent inquiry. We were actually helpless in the matter. I, therefore, submit that if you want non-official visitors to make any inquiries, they should be given facilities for knowing really what the grievances of the settlers are. They are persons of the lowest class and you place them against their will under the Criminal Tribes Act. They are there as much entitled to our consideration as other human beings. We should not make them feel that it is better to go to jail and rot there, than remain in this settlement."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"Mr. President, Sir, I have neither the time nor the eloquence, I fear, to make a suitable response to the very interesting and stimulating speech which we heard from our hon. friend Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu. I can only regret that the occasion of the Budget discussion, with its preoccupations and its restricted limit of speeches, does not allow us to give the matter the consideration which it properly

[Mr. A. R. Knapp]

[21st March 1923]

deserves. I only thank him for the recognition which he has accorded to my Department as doing all that it can for the solution of what he rightly describes as one of the most important problems which the Government have to face at the present moment. Two detailed points have been raised by my hon. friend. One was the suggestion that there should be a separate department for the depressed classes; that is, as I understand it, that we should separate the jurisdiction of the Commissioner of Labour from that of the Protector of the depressed classes. In that view I am entirely in accord with my hon. friend. But unfortunately at the present moment it is money which stands in the way. On the other point, namely, the encouragement of honorary work, there, again, I am in entire accord with my hon. friend. I have no doubt that in days to come it will be almost entirely, if not entirely, honorary work on which this movement for the elevation of the depressed classes will have to depend. At present, our position is that we will gladly receive any voluntary aid that comes forward. In this connexion I should like to make a constructive suggestion. It seems to me that the manner in which the depressed classes can best make a move in this direction is by establishing not only in Madras but at suitable places in the districts their own social service leagues. I can assure hon. Members of this House and others that any move in this direction will be most cordially welcomed by Mr. Paddison and myself.

"I now turn to the matter referred to by Mr. Krishna Rao, and I should like, in the first place, to make it perfectly clear to the House that his aspersions were not applied to all the settlements all over the Presidency but referred to one particular settlement. I say this because in the beginning of his speech he gave us some useful comments on the criminal settlement at Kavali but thereafter he let himself go and rather gave the impression that he was condemning all settlements. He said, for example, 'the public are not satisfied with the way in which the settlements are managed' and so on. I understood his speech however as intended to relate entirely to Kavali. I am quite prepared to admit that in respect of Kavali it is an unfortunate condition of affairs that the criminal settlers should regard themselves as better off in jail than in the settlement. I know it is sometimes the case. I have had personal experience of that myself. But I would like to remind my hon. friend in the first place that the conditions to which he was referring were those which existed during the absence of the Permanent Manager. I imagine that the Assistant Manager to whom he referred was only acting. Mr. Krishna Rao complained that the non-official visitors were not permitted to go round by themselves and hear complaints. I have noted that complaint, but may I remind him that there is another side to the question. It would not be fair that these complaints should be taken behind the manager's back. The person against whom the complaints are made should have a chance of being heard."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"May I explain that, Sir? I am quite willing that the manager should have a chance of being heard. But we must be in a position to get information in the first instance from the settlers themselves. No doubt we shall not be justified in taking any action on such complaints. But if you prevent information being given to us, there is no chance of our getting correct information. We must be given every facility to get information."



21st March 1923]

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"I quite understand my hon. friend's position. On the general question, I may say at once that I have already anticipated my hon. friend's demand for an early settlement of the Kavali problem. I visited the settlement last autumn and I then came to the conclusion that Mr. Bawdon, the permanent manager who was away, should return before we come to any final decision. It was difficult, during Mr. Bawdon's absence, to make any radical change. I therefore awaited his return which was in December. I have since visited the place with Mr. Paddison and we have arrived at decisions which are already in the course of being carried out. We have found on close examination that what was hitherto thought to be an almost insoluble problem, namely, the protection of the lands at Bitragunta from inundation, is apparently not so insoluble as was thought. Money is available during the coming year in the Public Works Department for certain works in connexion with the protection of the lands against inundation and we are arranging to remove a certain number of settlers at once from Kavali to Bitragunta. They will be settled on the land when reclaimed, and they will have plenty of work. We hope that thus in course of time we shall be able to remove the reproach which has been levelled against the Kavali settlement that we kept people there but give them no chance of earning a living wage. The settlers will go to Bitragunta in the first instance as labourers and when as labourers, they show that they are able to make good, we then hope to grant them the land, so that they may settle down there to a regular and honest life.

"As regards the financial side of the matter, that is not I hope going to present any great difficulties. I mentioned the other day, 3 p.m. in connexion with the writing off of certain advances, what our experience had been at Allur, namely, that land which formerly was worth one hundred rupees an acre had increased in value to Rs. 500 an acre owing to the labour that our settlement put into it. That I think is the answer to any suggestion that the financing of these operations presents any fatal obstacle. So far from the operation involving us in expense it shows every promise of being a profitable concern. Kavali will not disappear altogether. My proposal, at present, is that we should move to Kavali the settlers we have now at Guntur. Guntur has never been very successful. Mr. Bawdon, the manager at Kavali, is a keen disciplinarian, and I think my hon. friend will probably agree with me that his discipline, whether or not it was suitable as applied to the Kavali settlement, would be quite suitable if applied to the incorrigibles from Guntur."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"The only complaint is that he is sometimes too hard a disciplinarian."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"Mr. Bawdon will be in general supervision of all these three places, Kavali, Bitragunta and Allur. There will be a certain amount of saving in the abolition of the Guntur reformatory and that I hope will cover any extra expense involved at this stage; our hope is that we shall have ultimately at Kavali only 200 or 300 persons for whom to find work instead of 2,000 who at present constitute the population of that place."

Rao Bahadur V. APPASWAMI VANDAYAR:—"Sir, I have tabled a motion to reduce Rs. 100 out of the allotment of Rs. 1,23,500 for reclamation of Kallars."

[21st March 1923]

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—" You lost your opportunity. When your turn came you were not in your place. However you can say a few words on the motion."

Rao Bahadur V. APPASWAMI VANDAYAR :—" Sir, I tabled this motion No. 606 not for the purpose of eliciting information or criticising the Government but for the purpose of making a request. I belong to the Kallar community which is, in the ordinary sense of the term, a down-trodden class. Mr. Stawnbury, the Superintendent of Police, in his hard mood imagined that Tanjore Kallars must be brought under the Criminal Tribes Act. Thanks to experienced officers like Govinda Nayar and others, who discussed the matter with the leaders of that community, the idea of bringing these people under the Act was dropped. Now, in the conference it has been decided to furnish a scheme instead. We have submitted it, and I request that Government will bestow their sympathetic consideration to it by transferring a portion of the allotment for reclamation of Kallars in Madura to Tanjore. Again, I have to say that if only the statistics were gone through there would be no apprehension for such an idea. Permit me to join the previous speaker, the hon. Mr. R. Venkataratnam Nayudu, to leave the matter to non-official agency."

Rao Bahadur M. C. RAJA :—" Sir, I wanted to bring to the notice of this House one particular point, and that is, when the Department was started in 1919, it was intended for the sole purpose of protecting what are called the depressed classes, and consequently a number of functions were assigned to the Protector of Depressed Classes, so much so that this officer was swallowed up by the Commissioner of Labour, and now for the last three years we have been agitating for the bifurcation of this Department. There may be a separate Protector for the Depressed Classes and separate Commissioner of Labour to look after the labour affairs; but, Sir, for want of funds, the Council was not able to have this. As my revered friend, Diwan Bahadur Venkataratnam Nayudu, pointed out, we form one-sixth of the population of the presidency; we are more than 65 lakhs, and that is the reason why we require a separate officer with a separate department and a separate staff. Also, Sir, a Council like this should see that the first charge upon the Government is to improve the status of the depressed classes. It is a national concern. Unless the depressed classes, or a large portion of them, are brought to the level of the progressive classes, I do not think we will be nearer what all people call Swaraj. Unless opportunities are given to us to come up to the level of the progressive classes, I am sure the country will not progress. When we have popular Ministers and popular Government and democratic Councils, I do not think that there is any cause for despair. Therefore what I ask is that a considerable amount of money should be spent and a considerable amount of attention devoted to these matters. Moreover the Commissioner of Labour has got so many departments in his charge. He has to supervise labour, supervise the work connected with emigration, take steps for the amelioration of the depressed classes by helping them to form co-operative societies and purchase house-sites, by opening schools and making free grants and the amelioration of the condition of backward tribes like the Kallars. All these things will occupy a lot of his time, and the poor Labour Commissioner will have no time at all to look after the work of the amelioration of the depressed classes who form a population of 65 lakhs.



21st March 1923]

[Mr. M. C. Raja]

Moreover, at present, the work carried on is only in Madras, Tanjore, Gôdāvari, Chingleput and South Arcot."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The demand (Demand No. XXV) as reduced was then put to vote and passed.

## DEMAND XXVI—CIVIL WORKS (GRANTS TO LOCAL BODIES).

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—"Sir, I beg to move that the House may grant Demand No. XXVI—Civil Works (Grants to Local Bodies)—for a sum not exceeding 54.36 lakhs."

## MOTION No. 193.

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,00,000 for grants to the Malabar District Board for roads and bridges damaged during the rebellion by Rs. 100.*

"Sir, the amount that is now allotted for the District Board of Malabar for the restoration of roads and bridges damaged during the Mappilla rebellion is only one lakh. For the year 1923-24, the District Board has budgeted for a deficit of Rs. 1.64 lakhs, and the actual damage caused during the rebellion comes to Rs. 3.60 lakhs, so that with the deficit it comes to about five lakhs, but the amount that is allotted is only one lakh. So, I request the Minister to allot more funds for the restoration of these bridges and roads."

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—"Mr. President, there seems to be a slight inaccuracy in the statement made by my hon. friend from Malabar. He adds the deficit to the estimated cost of 3.60 lakhs. As a matter of fact, they have already effected some repairs, and the deficit is the result of such repairs. We have allotted one lakh of rupees in the current year's budget and we are going to allot another lakh in the coming year's budget. As to the question of giving larger grants, my hon. friend's request will be borne in mind, and when more funds are available it will be considered."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The demand was put to vote and passed and the grant was made.

## DEMAND XXVII—CIVIL WORKS (RESIDENCES OF THE GOVERNOR).

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 2.86 lakhs under Demand No. XXVII—Civil Works."

## MOTION No. 194.

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTIYAR :—"Sir, I beg to move—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 13,000 for constructing a new staircase in the Government House, Madras, by Rs. 5,000.*

Sir, the hon. the Finance Member at the close of his Budget speech suggested that instead of bringing in motions hon. Members might apply to the officers concerned for the information that they required. Accordingly, I went to the Chief Engineer's office to get some information about this staircase estimate. Some information was given; but the estimate was not there, and I was told that it must be referred to the third Minister for permission to be shown.

[Mr. T. Namberumal Chettiyar] [21st March 1923]

"I hope it will not be construed as want of courtesy on my part to pass remarks upon an estimate which concerns the comfort of His Excellency. But the figure seems to me to be very high, and what is more, either the calculation must be wrong or the figure exceedingly high. In pre-War days, when estimates were prepared, Rs. 2½ per square foot was the utmost that was allowed. Taking the case of the staircase to be constructed for the Government House, each step cannot be more than 10 feet long, 6 inches wide and 6 inches high. In other words, there will be 20 square feet per step which would not cost more than Rs. 60 in the pre-War days. Allowing for the present rate, say double, a step cannot be more than Rs. 120. Taking the height from floor to floor as 20 feet, there cannot be more than 40 steps. At that rate the staircase proper should not cost more than Rs. 4,000 or Rs. 5,000 at the highest. Therefore, I think the estimate of Rs. 13,000 for this staircase must include some other items or the provision is excessively high.

"I may say this by way of a suggestion: lower down in the budget in item 97 a sum of Rs. 8,000 is provided for an electric lift in the General Hospital. If instead of a staircase an electric lift is provided for, Rs. 8,000 would be quite ample and Rs. 5,000 will be saved. Apart from these considerations, this work will not be completed before the end of 1923-24, and as the time of departure of His Excellency the Governor will be approaching by that time, any addition now begun will be superfluous. I would therefore suggest either a revision of this estimate or the provision of an electric lift. If the hon. Member in charge will go into the question, I have no objection to withdraw it."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"I am afraid, Sir, I did not fully catch my hon. friend's comments. I am not sure if I have rightly understood him as suggesting that we should substitute for this staircase an electric lift."

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTIYAR:—"Yes, Sir, Rs. 8,000 will be sufficient for an electric lift and thus there will be a saving of Rs. 5,000. In item 97 of the Budget an electric lift is provided for the General Hospital at a cost of Rs. 8,000. The same thing may be done in this case also."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"I do not profess to be an expert on the subject of the cost of electric lifts, but I am very much surprised indeed to hear that the cost of a lift to be put up at the Government House would be only Rs. 8,000.

"But on the general question as to whether this estimate is or is not excessive, I can only say that in this matter I am entirely in the hands of my hon. colleague to my left. For my part, I have merely to provide money in the budget and it is for his subordinates to prepare the estimates and to carry out the work. I have not very much doubt that if my hon. friend opposite who proposed this motion were to come forward and offer to construct this staircase at the reduced price of Rs. 8,000, my hon. colleague would gladly accept the offer."

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTIYAR:—"I want to point out one thing, Sir. Year after year, whenever I say that the estimate is too high, the hon. Member on the side of Government invariably asks me to offer to do the work myself (laughter). Last year and the year before it was the same case; and the hon. Sir Lionel Davidson also once spoke in the same



21st March 1923] [Mr. T. Namberumal Chettiyar]

strain. What I wanted to say was to ask the hon. Member if he could not put up an electric lift at a cost of Rs. 8,000 instead of a staircase thus saving Rs. 5,000. I withdraw the motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The demand was then put to the House and the grant was made.

#### DEMAND XXVIII—CIVIL WORKS (TRANSFERRED).

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"Sir, I beg to move under Demand XXVIII—Civil Works—for the grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 83.74 lakhs."

#### MOTION No. 195.

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"Sir, I move—

*To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,00,000 for the construction of buildings for the East Coast Striking Force.*

So far as this motion is concerned, I believe the policy of it was discussed fully on a motion of mine tabled for the elimination of the provision made in the Budget for the East Coast Special Force. The House is aware that the policy enunciated by the hon. the Law Member was disputed at considerable length and that from all sections of the House it was pointed out that there was no justification for this East Coast Special Police being appointed. It would also be clear that at the time when the question was decided, the question arose as to whether the provision was a permanent one or whether it was only temporary. It will be remembered that all the sections of this House joined in opposing the provision for the East Coast Special Police, except some members of the Finance Committee who found themselves in a difficult position owing to this matter having been placed before them and owing to their having given their consent to it. I remember Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar having said in connexion with that motion that the Finance Committee did not approve of the policy of this Special Force but that they allowed the provision to remain for one year. He said that that was the chief reason which induced him to accept the provision in the Finance Committee. I may again remind this House that at the time that motion was put to the vote, the hon. the President, who was then in the Chair, pointed out that what we were voting for then was not for or against the policy underlying the Special Police but only for the retention or reduction of the provision for next year, though we raised the point whether this force was a permanent one or not. I therefore wish to remind hon. Members of this House who gave permission for this being retained in the Budget for next year to remember that they gave the sanction to this provision only for the next year and that that did not give the stamp of permanency to this measure. Almost all were agreed that this Special Force ought not to be a permanent measure though it might be allowed to continue for one year. On the other hand, if hon. Members do not want to vote in favour of this motion but allow this provision of Rs. 1 lakh for the construction of buildings for the East Coast Striking Force to stand even for one year, I might remind them that it will be clear from the Public Works Department estimate that no estimates have been prepared or sanctioned but only a lump provision has been made for Rs. 1 lakh. I understand that the cost of the buildings, when the final estimates are ready, will cover

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu] [21st March 1923]

several lakhs. If once we sanction one lakh and allow the construction of buildings to be proceeded with, it will be impossible to allow the buildings to remain in that condition; and therefore we shall have to give our sanction for an expenditure of six, seven or eight lakhs which may be something more when the estimates are revised. Once we sanction this provision we shall declare once for all that we are going to have an East Coast Special Force in the northern districts as a permanent factor. I need not repeat the arguments advanced last time. But I may say that if there are any special emergencies, such emergencies can be met by special measures taken for the purpose. But there is no justification for this provision."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"I beg to support this motion. We find in this demand a large number of items intended either for the police or for the jails or for their officers or warders, but there is nothing at all for the people in shape of irrigation works which they very much wish to have. Therefore on a point of economy, we must cut this provision out.

"Again, you will find in the Budget no estimate is given at all as to how much it is going to cost, and for what use this one lakh is going to be put. We do not know where we will end, and it may cost 10, 12 or 15 lakhs. To-morrow, perhaps we might abolish the East Coast Police. Therefore, I submit, Sir, that I would very well vote for this amount if it is intended for the people and not for the officers' quarters or the police or the jails."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"Mr. President, I would only like to make two appeals. One is to the House, and

8-30 p.m.

that is to keep in mind what was said by the hon. the President when sanctioning the item in the Police Budget relating to the East Coast Striking Force, namely, that the House was not committing itself to any policy regarding the force. If we allow this grant, we will, on the other hand, be committing ourselves to the acceptance of the principle of having test forces. The second appeal that I would make is to the hon. the Law Member himself. He said that this question was going to be placed before the Police Committee, the Police Committee therefore is to decide whether this force is necessary or not. Let him not prejudge the case, and let him not make the Retrenchment Committee or the Police Committee prejudge the case. It is for him to place this matter before the Police Committee, and it is for the Police Committee to arrive at a decision thereon. If their decision is in favour of the construction of these buildings, then he will have to come and ask the Council to sanction this expenditure either this year or next year by way of a supplementary grant. In view of what has been said on the motion regarding this force in the Police Budget, I think it would be fair not to sanction this item."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"Sir, I see from the hon. Members' speeches what their idea is. But there are two circumstances which I desire to place before the House. As I said in the course of my remarks on this force, the anxiety of the Government is that as far as possible the military should not be employed and that a striking force should be available. That was the reason for the formation of this force. Now, it is quite true that the final estimates in regard to this building are not available to be placed before the House. But what I would suggest is that it is nobody's case that a body of this character can be brought into existence



21st March 1923]

[C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar]

with any utility or effect unless they have got adequate buildings and unless those buildings are compactly situated. I shall illustrate my point. Supposing you must have this armed force, are the members of this armed force to be scattered all over Vizianagram or Rajahmundry or towns of that character? The very object of having the force would be frustrated by doing so. Therefore, this provision is made with the view of completing the idea of having this armed force. The fact that there is this Budget grant does not make it incumbent upon anyone to say that there must be an armed force if the Retrenchment Committee or any other body that examines this question arrives at a decision which will make the Government reconsider the whole question. But it seems to me that so long as we have an armed force, we must have a provision of this character for buildings for that force. It must not be forgotten that the Finance Committee sanctioned this grant."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"Sir, I only wish to point out in reply that the arguments of the hon. the Law Member cannot at all be accepted by this House. He has said that there are no complete estimates, that having had a police force they should have buildings, and that if the Retrenchment Committee or any other body come to the conclusion that the force is not necessary, the whole policy may be revised. But I think that the policy must be decided first in this House. As for the policy, I may say that almost all the non-official Members of this House spoke against the policy of having this Striking Force. The policy of the House can also be taken to be against such a force by reason of the fact that the votes on the main motion were equally divided, and the motion was rejected by the casting vote of the President. The hon. the President in putting the motion then said that the House by voting on that motion were not voting on the policy of having the force, but only regarding that particular provision. Therefore the policy having already been expressed by this House, I think it will only be doing its duty in voting for this motion. If the effect of passing this motion is going to be that the East Coast Striking Force will have to be disbanded without a local habitation, even then that contingency is welcome. Again, I may point out that there is no force at all at Vizianagram at present, and this is a new provision. I can understand a provision for a force which is already there. But here, when there is no force at all, something is proposed to be provided for next year. Therefore, I say that the House should vote for this motion."

The motion was put and declared carried.

The hon. Mr. A. R. Knapp demanded a poll, which was accordingly taken with the following result:—

*Ayes.*

1. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalinga Chetti-  
yar.
2. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai.
3. S. R. Y. Ankinedu Prasad Bahadur.
4. Mr. M. Appalanarasayya Nayudu.
5. Rao Bahadur V. Appaswami  
• Vandayar.
6. Diwan Bahadur C. Arunaachala  
Mudaliyar.

7. Rao Bahadur P. C. Ethirajulu  
Nayudu.
8. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar.
9. Rao Bahadur O. Tanikachala Chetti-  
yar.
10. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar.
11. Rao Bahadur K. Gopalakrishna Iyya.
12. Mr. K. P. Gopala Menon.
13. „ K. A. Kandaswami Kandar.

(21st March 1923)

*Ayes—cont.*

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 14. Mr. J. Kuppuswami.                     | 34. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo.               |
| 15. „ E. Muniswami Nayudu.                 | 35. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhacharlu.           |
| 16. „ A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chettiyar.    | 36. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao.                       |
| 17. „ V. Pakkiriswami Pillai.              | 37. Sriman Sasibbushan Kath Mahasayo.            |
| 18. „ P. T. Rajan.                         | 38. Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar.                   |
| 19. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Punja.          | 39. „ M. K. Seturatnam Ayyar.                    |
| 20. Mr. K. Sarabha Reddi.                  | 40. „ A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.                   |
| 21. „ W. P. A. Saundarapandia Nadar.       | 41. „ K. Prabhakaran Tampan.                     |
| 22. „ R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar.          | 42. „ A. D. M. Bavotti Sahib.                    |
| 23. „ K. Sitarama Reddi.                   | 43. Khan Sahib A. P. I. Saiyid Ibrahim Ravuttar. |
| 24. „ T. Somasundara Mudaliyar.            | 44. Mustapha Ravuttar Ahmad Miran Sahib.         |
| 25. „ P. Subbarayan.                       | 45. Khan Sahib Abdur Rahim.                      |
| 26. „ A. Tangavelu Nayagar.                | 46. Khan Sahib Saiyid Diwan Abdul Razaq Sahib.   |
| 27. „ V. C. Vellingiri Goundar.            | 47. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Sadulla Badsha Sahib.  |
| 28. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu. | 48. Mr. Haji Abdulla Sahib Bahadur.              |
| 29. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju.   | 49. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib.           |
| 30. Mr. P. Siva Rao.                       | 50. Rao Sahib Sir M. C. Muttayya Chettiyar.      |
| 31. „ C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar.        |  |
| 32. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu. |  |
| 33. Mr. M. Suryanarayana.                  |  |

*Noes.*

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter.          | 12. Mr. E. F. Thomas.                    |
| 2. „ Khan Bahadur Sir M. Habib-ullah Sahib. | 13. „ E. Periyanyagam.                   |
| 3. „ Raja of Panagal.                       | 14. Rao Sahib T. C. Tangavelu Pillai.    |
| 4. „ Rai Bahadur K. Venkatarreddi Nayudu.   | 15. Mr. S. Somasundaram Pillai.          |
| 5. „ Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro.               | 16. Rev. W. Weston.                      |
| 6. „ Mr. A. R. Knapp.                       | 17. Mr. C. R. T. Congreve.               |
| 7. „ Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar.             | 18. Khan Bahadur Abbas Ali.              |
| 8. Mr. E. S. Lloyd.                         | 19. Rao Bahadur M. C. Raja.              |
| 9. „ A. Y. G. Campbell.                     | 20. Mr. L. C. Guruswami.                 |
| 10. „ R. D. Richmond.                       | 21. Rao Sahib P. Venkatarangayya.        |
| 11. Diwan Bahadur T. N. Sivagnanam Pillai.  | 22. Rao Bahadur T. Numberumal Chettiyar. |

The motion was carried, 50 voting for and 22 against.

## MOTION No. 196.

3-45 p.m. Rao Bahadur T. NUMBERUMAL CHETTIYAR:—“Sir, I beg to move—

*that the allotment of Rs. 15,000 for constructing a residence for the District Superintendent of Police, Cocanada, be reduced by Rs. 5,000.*

Sir, I only wish to point out that there exists great difference between similar provisions for buildings for District Superintendents of Police in other places, and I have given notice of motions on them lower down the agenda. Item No. 37 is for quarters for a Superintendent of Police and comes under this motion. There is another item of estimate for residence of a Superintendent of Police, which is put down at Rs. 21,000, whereas item 49, which is for a similar purpose, is only Rs. 15,000. These differences are very great and therefore I desire information on the point.”

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—“Sir, when the items referred to by the hon. Member are reached, I shall explain how each



21st March 1923] [Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar]

particular amount came to be put in there. In one case we had to purchase a suitable building and the amount of Rs. 16,000 put in represents the purchase price negotiated for the building. So far as the item to which this motion relates is concerned, the matter went up to the Finance Committee who came to the conclusion that no suitable house could be obtained for rent, that the existing accommodation was insufficient and that the Superintendent of Police was put to considerable inconvenience and discomfort and was depending on the charity of any one who offered to take him in. The Superintendent of Police is an important officer, and the estimate asked for the building for him is Rs. 15,000."

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTIYAR :—"I understand, Sir, that one case referred to was of purchase and the other of constructing a new building. But I wanted to know the reason for the difference between estimates for construction, say, in the district of Cuddapah and in Cocanada. Anyhow, I do not press the motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

MOTION No. 197.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—"Sir, I beg to move—

*To omit the allotment of Rs. 35,000 for constructing huts for 20 head constables of the A-1 and A-2 Police lines, Puduket.*

I leave it to the hon. Member Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar to give detailed reasons in support of this motion."

Rao Bahadur O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—"Sir, if the proposition before the House is so simple as it appears to be, namely, that a provision be made for building huts for head constables, I should be the last person to object to it. But it is part of an expenditure of Rs. 3,40,500. Surely, for building huts for these head constables, 20 in number, a sum of Rs. 3,40,500 is not necessary nor is a sum of Rs. 35,000 required. The fact is that a large scheme for constructing residences for a number of police officers, the lowest of whom is the police constable, is really sought to be executed and this is only the thin end of the wedge for forcing upon us the larger scheme costing Rs. 3,40,500. The policy of the House has been to allow the ordinary constables and the head constables residences at Government expense and to leave all others to provide their own residences. At any rate that is the decision which, I may be permitted to say, has been come to by the Retrenchment Committee. This sum of Rs. 35,000 will not be sufficient even to raise the foundations in accordance with the big scheme estimated at Rs. 3,40,500. With a view to obviate the possibility of this amount being expended and the Government afterwards saying 'We have thrown away so much money in raising the foundations, the large sum of 3 lakhs and odd should be granted to us,' I move that the allotment be omitted. If the Government come later on with a proposal for constructing houses for constables and head constables only and with the amount necessary therefor, I feel the slightest doubt that the House will refuse sanction. Now, I move that this provision towards a part of the bigger scheme be omitted."

Rao Bahadur M. C. RAJA :—"Sir, my object in tabling the motion was not to say anything about the big scheme of 3 lakhs and odd but only

[Mr. M. C. Raja]

[21st March 1923]

to bring to the notice of the hon. the Law Member that the location of the huts is objectionable. For the site chosen is at present occupied by a number of families who belong to the community that I represent here (depressed classes). I should like to bring to the notice of this Council, Sir, that on no account should people living in any locality be ousted simply because the Government want to put up buildings for their officials. I will be the last person to object to the construction of houses for police constables. They deserve it and it is essential that they should be concentrated at a particular spot. But what I object to is that, instead of the Government finding place elsewhere by cutting out the compounds attached to the bungalows where rich people live or by some other way, they should be cruel enough to ask people, especially the depressed classes, living in a particular area to vacate their sites. I hope the hon. the Law Member will sympathize with me in this matter and see his way to choose a different site. There is a big maidan, for instance, near the Spur Tank where ample space can be got. I leave it to him to choose another site, but I would request him not to disturb those who are now occupying the proposed site."

MR. L. C. GURUSWAMI :—" Sir, the hon. Members who have preceded me have stated the case for the motion and I feel it not necessary on my part to make a speech. I would only request the hon. the Law Member to see his way to omit the provision."

THE hon. MR. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—" I may at once mention, Mr. President, in reply to Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyyar that the present scheme is not necessarily to serve as any foundation for the scheme of 3 lakhs and odd. This particular allotment, which alone is before the House, is for the construction of huts for 20 head constables. It should, however, be pointed out that all the members of the Madras City Police are entitled to free quarters as a condition of service. It now happens that houses are rented for constables where Government quarters are not available. These men are living in rented quarters scattered all over the city, and this is a condition which is prejudicial to the discipline and efficiency of the force. In order to obviate that, the present proposal is made. If there is any bigger scheme undoubtedly the House will have the opportunity to consider it, before pronouncing itself in favour of it or against it, though the policy of Government is certainly to provide quarters for these forces."

RAI BAHADUR T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—" Sir, I am afraid, the hon. the Law Member has not understood the scheme. The scheme is estimated at 3 lakhs and odd and a portion of it is proposed to be allotted for and executed in the ensuing year."

THE hon. MR. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—" Mr. President, apparently hon. Members have been referring to page 12 of the Public Works Budget. I may state that I shall obtain information about that; but it seems to me that that figure is obviously misplaced. Later on, I shall explain it. So far as this scheme is concerned, the approximate estimates which are under the scrutiny of the Superintending Engineer amount to only Rs. 35,000."

RAO BAHADUR O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—" Sir, with some knowledge of the Budget and of the way it is prepared, I may say that this figure of Rs. 3,40,500 is put in brackets indicating that it is one of the revised figures of the Budget already prepared. While my hon. friend, the Law Member,



21st March 1923] [Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar]

confesses that he has not sufficient information about it, I think the best course will be to eliminate the item altogether from the Budget, and afterwards, if the Finance Committee or the House is satisfied, provision can be made by way of a supplemental demand. Supplementary demands are nothing new to us. Knowing that all information is not available and feeling as we do that we are not in full possession of the facts, let us put off the grant till we are satisfied that it is not a portion of a bigger scheme."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—"It must be remembered that the scheme was before the Finance Committee and was passed."

The motion was put and declared carried. A poll was taken and the House divided thus :—

*Ayes.*

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar. | 26. Mr. A. Somasundara Mudaliyar.               |
| 2. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai.           | 27. " P. Abbayyan.                              |
| 3. S. R. Y. Ankinedu Prasad Bahadur.      | 28. Diwan Bahadur K. Suryanarayanamurti Nayudu. |
| 4. Mr. M. Appalarasayya Nayudu.           | 29. Mr. A. Tangavelu Nayagar.                   |
| 5. " R. Appaswami Nayudu.                 | 30. " V. C. Vellingiri Goundar.                 |
| 6. Diwan Bahadur C. Arunachala Mudaliyar. | 31. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu.      |
| 7. Rao Sahib S. Ellappa Chettiyar.        | 32. " C. V. S. Narasimha Raju.                  |
| 8. Rao Bahadur P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu.   | 33. Mr. P. Siva Rao.                            |
| 9. Sir P. Tyagaraya Chettiyar.            | 34. " C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar.             |
| 10. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu.     | 35. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu.      |
| 11. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar.      | 36. Mr. M. Suryanarayana.                       |
| 12. Rao Bahadur O. Tanikachala Chettiyar. | 37. Nriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo.              |
| 13. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar.       | 38. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimha Chariu.         |
| 14. Rao Bahadur K. Gopalakrishnayya.      | 39. Sriman Sasibhusan Rath Mahasayo.            |
| 15. Mr. K. P. Gopala Menon.               | 40. Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar.                  |
| 16. " J. Koppuswami.                      | 41. " M. K. Seturatnam Ayyar.                   |
| 17. " B. Muniswami Nayudu.                | 42. A. D. M. Bavotti Sahib Bahadur.             |
| 18. " A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chettiyar.   | 43. A. P. I. Saiyid Ibrahim Ravuttar.           |
| 19. " V. P. Pakkiriswami Pillai.          | 44. Ahmad Miran Sahib Bahadur.                  |
| 20. " P. T. Rajan.                        | 45. Muhammad Abdur Rahim Khan Sahib.            |
| 21. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Punja.         | 46. Saiyid Diwan Abdul Razaq Sahib.             |
| 22. Mr. K. Sarabha Reddi.                 | 47. Haji Abdulla Sahib.                         |
| 23. " W. P. A. Saundarapandiya Nadar.     | 48. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib.          |
| 24. " R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar.         |   |
| 25. " K. Sitarama Reddi.                  |   |

*Noes.*

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter.            | 11. Mr. E. F. Thomas.                                   |
| 2. " Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur. | 12. " E. Periyannayagam.                                |
| 3. " the Raja of Panagal.                     | 13. Rao Sahib T. C. Tangavelu Pillai.                   |
| 4. " Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu.     | 14. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar.                         |
| 5. " Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro.                 | 15. " S. Muttumanikkaachari.                            |
| 6. " Mr. A. R. Knapp.                         | 16. Rev. W. Meston.                                     |
| 7. " Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar.               | 17. Mr. C. R. T. Congreve.                              |
| 8. Mr. E. S. Lloyd.                           | 18. Abbas Ali Khan Bahadur.                             |
| 9. " A. Y. G. Campbell.                       | 19. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Sadulla Badsha Sahib Bahadur. |
| 10. " R. D. Richmond.                         | 20. Rao Bahadur T. A. Numberumal Chettiyar.             |

*Ayes : 48 ; Noes : 20.*

The motion was carried.

[21st March 1923]

## MOTION No. 198.

Rao Bahadur M. C. RAJA :—" Sir, I beg to move—

*To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,50,000 for improvements to the Madras University Students' Club, Madras.*

Sir, I move for this omission with a view to ask for information from the hon. the Minister for Education about the Adi-Dravida Government Training School in Madras. I was told, Sir, that it had no permanent location and that the school was to be removed. I should like to know whether any proposal has been made for the permanent location of the school which, I may add, has been in existence for over twenty or thirty years."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" There is an Adi-Dravida training school and there is also a boarding section attached to it. They are all located in a building, and it is contemplated that a new building should be constructed for the hostel as well as for the training school; and as soon as plans and estimates are ready, the site will be selected. A site is also under investigation. The school has now been located in a building only a portion of the compound of which was allotted for a new building under construction. Otherwise it has got its boarding house and school in the same building."

Rao Bahadur M. C. RAJA :—" I beg leave to withdraw the motion, Sir." The motion was by leave withdrawn.

## MOTION No. 199.

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTIYAR :—" Sir, I move—

*To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,00,000 for Leper Colony at Chingleput*

I understand, Sir, that provision was to be made for 36 lepers, and that the amount provided therefor is a lakh of rupees. I think that the construction of a tin shed or corrugated shed for each leper will only cost Rs. 100 and calculating at that rate a provision of Rs. 3,600 will be sufficient. I therefore suggest that the allotment may be reduced considerably."

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—" Although the provision is made for the accommodation of 300 patients at present, it is expected  
4 p.m. that in course of time accommodation can easily be increased for 2,000 patients. Moreover, the whole of the money does not come from the Government. Her Excellency Lady Willingdon was able to get one lakh of rupees from the Red Cross Society. I hope my hon. friend will accept this explanation."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

## MOTION No. 200.

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTIYAR :—" Sir, I beg to move—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 20,000 for improvements to the Cooum river, Madras, by Rs. 100.*

Sir, this important question of improvements to the Cooum has been engaging the attention of the Government and the experts for a long time. In 1890, a Committee was appointed to draw up a scheme for water-supply and



21st March 1923] [Mr. T. Namberumal Chettiyar] .

drainage and the cleansing of the Coom of the City. Both Col. J. Penny-  
quick and Mr. Jones prepared independent notes. These were referred to an  
expert, Mr. Cousins, and his report was again sent to Col. Pennyquick and  
Jones. Col. Pennyquick was then on furlough and he sent his note on 28th  
September 1893 wherein he observes as follows :

Mr. Cousins' proposals for connecting the Coom with the sea are very much simpler than  
those prepared by myself in modification of Mr. Jones' scheme; this is of course because all  
sewage being kept out of the river there is not the same necessity for maintaining a constant  
circulation, nor for passing so large a body of tidal water through the river as existed under  
the conditions with which Mr. Jones and myself were dealing. Under the new conditions  
introduced by the exclusion of sewage from the river the simple culvert with an area of 132  
square feet will probably be sufficient, though I confess I should prefer to see the principle of  
admitting water at one point and discharging it at another adhered to.

Mr. Jones also prepared a note criticising Mr. Cousins' scheme and this note  
is dated October 1893.

Mr. Cousins, in describing the opening and closing of the bar, says: 'if the inrush of  
water and its subsequent exit were the only forces at work, the mouth of the river would be  
possibly open the whole year round, but when the amount of water entering and leaving the  
river is the same, that is when the backwater (Coom?) has ceased to flow, the mouth at once  
begins to close up', that is to say that the formation of the bar is due to the action of the sea  
alone, and the bar forms when the forces allied against it no longer exist. It is apparently on  
such grounds, I say apparently because the only reason given for the rejection, not only of my  
scheme but of the scheme as modified by Col. Pennyquick, is 'from my observations, I am con-  
vinced' that these schemes have been rejected.

Mr. Jones further says :

It is desirable to point out that, even though the drainage works or some of them  
proposed are carried out, the improvement of the Coom will be none the less necessary.

"Mr. Jones suggested the names of Mr. Wheeler, Mr. Kinniple, Mr. Shel-  
ford, Mr. Coode—all expert members of the Institution of Civil Engineers.  
It was also suggested that Mr. Wheeler was the best man to be consulted  
because he had studied the question of harbour entrances under circum-  
stances somewhat similar to those which prevailed in the Bay of Bengal.

"The Government in their Order, dated the 25th January 1894, referred  
Mr. Jones' notes to Col. Pennyquick with the request that he would deal  
fully with the engineering aspect of the several questions raised in the  
notes and would give his opinion after examining the plans as to the pro-  
bable cost of the works proposed by Mr. Cousins. Meanwhile it was ordered  
that complete information should be obtained regarding the systems of  
drainage adopted in the towns of Bombay, Calcutta and Rangoon and their  
cost.

"Colonel Pennyquick returned the papers on 14th August 1894 agreeing  
in several respects with Mr. Cousins' scheme. Colonel Pennyquick in the  
course of his long note says :

That modifications will have to be made in certain constructive details, such as those  
alluded to in paragraph 27 of Mr. Jones' report, and doubtless in many others, is certain; there  
never yet was a large engineering scheme carried out without such alterations, but it is a waste  
of time to discuss details of this kind until the general outline of the design is accepted.

The question of the improvement of the Coom is intimately connected with that of the  
drainage, but it by no means follows that dealing with it should be postponed until the latter  
question is settled, and there are various reasons for discussing it as a separate question.

[Mr. T. Namberumal Chettiyar] [21st March 1923]

Mr. Cousins proposes the very simple and inexpensive course of connecting the river with the sea by means of a small culvert terminating in a group of six steel pipes, and on a first perusal of his report I was not prepared to assert that if the drainage system were so thoroughly carried out as to ensure the exclusion of all sewage from the river this plan would not ensure the entrance of sufficient water from the sea, though for the reasons stated in my note of September last I should recommend the omission of the steel tubes, and should greatly prefer to see the canal from the harbour constructed in addition to the culvert.

It is very doubtful whether financial considerations will allow the drainage schemes to be carried out for some years to come, and whether it be carried out or not it would in my opinion be a fatal mistake to defer dealing with the Cooum.

I believe that the question of water-supply is of much greater sanitary importance in this country than that of drainage, and that if the improvements to the water-supply and to the river Cooum were carried out the improvements in the sanitary conditions of the city would be so great that the question of drainage might safely be left alone, provided the existing system as properly worked.

"Thus it will be seen that Colonel Pennycuik advocates the cleansing of the Cooum as of paramount importance. These notes are again referred to the Government and the Government passed orders thereon on 7th November 1894 and in it they observed as follows:

The Chief Engineer will now be requested to at once make arrangements for drawing up detailed estimates of the outlay that the execution of this project would involve. The estimates should provide for a lock to admit of boats passing between the canal and the harbour, as well as for sluices to allow of the entry of sea-water during flood tides and of its discharge at the Cooum mouth during ebbs. His Excellency the Governor in Council trusts that the execution of the scheme for the water-supply of the city and for the purification of the Cooum now approved will be followed by a marked advance in the sanitary condition of Madras.

"When the Government had taken steps to push through the scheme as early as 1894, we now find that the scheme prepared by the Chief Engineer is still in the investigation stage. I therefore trust that the Government will bring pressure to bear on the Committee that is investigating the scheme now so that it may be put into operation at an early date, and the Cooum which is now a filthy drain, converted into a healthy stream."

Diwan Bahadur Sir P. TYAGARAYA CHETTIYAR:—"Sir, this House must be really thankful to the hon. Member, Mr. Namberumal Chettiyar, for having placed before it the full history regarding the Cooum affair. He has traced the history of the scheme for the improvement of the Cooum from the year 1894. He gave us the old story connected with the Cooum affair. But the new story is that a Committee has been appointed for having the scheme examined with the aid of experts. I myself am on the Committee. I believe the Committee will go into the whole matter once again and come to a final decision very soon. There is no use of discussing the merits or demerits of the scheme in the House before the Committee sends up its final conclusions on the matter. It is admitted that the whole of the Madras City is keenly interested in the Cooum affair. The Corporation and myself are also interested in seeing that the scheme is successfully worked out.

"Then, Sir, I may mention for the information of my hon. friend that the sum of Rs. 20,000 provided in the Budget is simply to cover the travelling expenses of the members who proceed with the investigation of the scheme."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"Sir, I am glad that my hon. friend, Mr. Namberumal Chettiyar, has brought this Cooum improvement to great prominence in this House. There is absolutely no doubt that the Cooum



21st March 1923]

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

requires improvement, if the health of the Madras City is to be improved. This question is not a new one. As pointed out by the hon. mover of this motion, this matter was taken up in earnest 30 years ago by eminent Engineers like Col. Pennycuik and Mr. Jones. They prepared a scheme, and subsequent to that there were other schemes. The Chief Engineer, Mr. Hutton, prepared one scheme, and the Harbour Engineer, Col. Bradford Leslie, prepared another scheme. These two schemes are not different, but the one supplements the other. There were also other schemes connecting the Cooum with the Adayar river. All these were before the Government. An outline of all these schemes was prepared and placed before the Finance Department. The Finance Department rightly pointed out that unless there was agreement among the Engineers themselves and a definite scheme working out the whole thing was placed before them, they would not be able to adjudge the financial liability. Therefore the matter is now placed in the hands of the Engineering experts, experts who have had intimate knowledge of the workings of the Cooum river. As pointed out by my hon. Friend, Sir Tyagaraya Chettiyar, the Committee of Experts have already met, and discussed the matter. They propose to modify

4-15 p.m.

the scheme in such a way that it should prove to be a great and permanent improvement to the City of Madras. I will not anticipate the result of the deliberations of that Committee. They seem to work on right lines now and as soon as a scheme is prepared, I shall place it before the Government for acceptance and afterwards there will be no delay in executing the scheme as prepared by the experts."

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTIYAR :—"The decision of this Committee should not be referred to another body of experts. I beg to withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

MOTION No. 201.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"Sir, I beg to move the following :—

*To omit the allotment of Rs. 10,600 for the Assistant to the Consulting Architect.*

Not long ago, Sir, there was only one Architect for the Government of Madras, but now we have three. This very large increase in the number of Architects does not seem to be justifiable. In the old days, we had more money to be spent on buildings than we have at present and in spite of it the number of Architects has increased ; it should on the other hand decrease. Then with regard to works that are turned out by these Architects, there is very much to be said. I will only give an instance which came under my personal experience when I had to come in contact with these officers. A certain design and estimates were sanctioned both by the Education Department and by the Superintending Engineer. The Superintending Engineer is supposed to know the local conditions and necessities better. When the proposal was sent up to the Government for a grant, apparently these papers were sent up to one of these Consulting Architects. The Architect took a number of objections which seemed to me not in the interest of either the local body or the Government. For instance, one of the proposals which he

[Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar] [21st March 1923]

objected to was this. I provided for a staircase in the veranda so that I could spare some space as well as save a lot of money. The Architect said that the staircase should not be in the veranda and that I ought to put up a building adjacent to the block of buildings and erect a new structure altogether which would involve something like an expenditure of two or three thousands. That was one of the proposals he made. Another proposal of his was, instead of saving some Rs. 6,000 or Rs. 7,000 as I intended to do by the design proposed he wanted all the rooms in a line and thereby incur additional expenditure. He said that the teacher should sit in one place. I explained to him that if the teacher's position was changed, his objection would disappear; but his answer was that the teacher ought to be in a particular place and his position should not be changed. Such objections show how much we can benefit by the experience of these architects. I do not want to enlarge on the matter further. As I said, there are too many architects now and I do not think there can be sufficient work for them in our present condition when we cannot find large funds for buildings. So I think at least one of these architects may be asked to go."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" Sir, I appreciate the difficulty which the hon. Member has pointed out in the matter of the structure of buildings. But the hon. Member must remember that he prepares the whole plan from the information furnished to the Director of Public Instruction by the local authorities, that is, the management—the district board or the taluk board. There may be mistakes like that, and I do admit that in the particular case which the hon. Member discussed with me, there seems to have been some mistake. But I do not think that my hon. friend can base the omission of this grant on the ground that there was a mistake in a particular item of work. As regards the Assistant Consulting Architect, I may say that at present his hands are full. He has plenty of work to do, and if at any time there is no work for him, it may be only for a few months; but otherwise he is ordinarily engaged in assisting the chief Consulting Architect. The Assistant Consulting Architect not only does independent work himself, but also takes charge of the office whenever the Consulting Architect goes on tour. There is no other person who can look after the draughtsmen and the detailed work that has necessarily to be done in the office of the Consulting Architect, whenever the latter officer goes on tour. In the matter of preparing original work also, the Assistant Architect has got much to do at present. These Consulting Architects come under what is called Special Service. They are working under a contract for five years. They have not completed their period of service yet, and it is impossible to dispense with their services immediately. But whenever there is no work for the Assistant Consulting Architect, I shall be the first man to say that his services are not required."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Demand XXVIII for the grant of 83.74 lakhs was then put to the House and the grant was made *minus* the deductions voted for already.

#### DEMAND XXIX—FAMINE RELIEF.

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—" Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding one lakh under Famine Relief."



21st March 1923]

The demand was put and carried and the grant was made.

DEMAND XXX—PENSIONS.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding 48.25 lakhs for Pensions."

The demand was put and carried and the grant was made.

DEMAND XXXI—STATIONERY (FOR RESERVED DEPARTMENTS)  
AND PRINTING.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding 24.48 lakhs for Stationery (for Reserved Departments) and Printing."

MOTION No. 202.

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" I beg to move the following :—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 24.48 lakhs for Stationery and Printing (Reserved Departments) by 3 lakhs.*

In moving this I wish to call the attention of the hon. the Finance Member to the enormous expenditure under Stationery. The Revised Estimate for the current year is Rs. 19,81,000, but in the coming year, 1923-24, the estimate is for about 23½ lakhs, that is, for more than 3½ lakhs. I should like to call the attention of the hon. the Finance Member to this and request him to reduce this as much as possible. I hope it will be possible to the hon. Member to reduce it appreciably."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" Sir, I take it that the House do not wish to spend a great deal of time upon the stationery estimates now, and so I shall not reply in detail. We are doing everything we can to reduce the issues of stationery. But even if we reduce them, the fact very often does not appear in the accounts, because the accounts are kept in rupees and the quantity of stationery represented by a given sum of money varies from time to time in accordance with the prices fixed. To give the House an idea of how wide these fluctuations may be, I will take as an instance the commonest kind of paper which is responsible for three-quarters of our issues. The price of this has varied within the last few years from 2 annas 4½ pies per lb. to 6 annas 8½ pies per lb., in other words, it has increased by 200 per cent. Thus, the House will realise from this one instance how an increase in the rupee value of the issues may accompany a considerable actual reduction in the quantities issued."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Demand XXXI was then put and carried and the grant was made.

DEMAND XXXII—STATIONERY (FOR TRANSFERRED DEPARTMENTS).

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding 2.04 lakhs for Stationery (for Transferred Departments)."

The demand was put and carried and the grant was made.

[21st March 1923]

## DEMAND XXXIII—RESERVE WITH THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" With your permission, Sir, I propose not to move this demand in pursuit of the policy of reducing our deficit by every possible means."

## DEMAND XXXIV—AGENCY.

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—" Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding 33.60 lakhs for Agency."

## MOTION No. 203.

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" Sir, I am generally not in favour of reductions like the one I have the honour to move, but different cases  
4-30 p.m. require different treatment and this case certainly requires a different treatment from the rest of the demands. So, I move—

*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 33.60 lakhs for Agency by Rs. 5,00,000.*

As I said in my speech during the general discussion on the Budget, I think it is time that the Madras Government come to the conclusion that a separate Agency division is not necessary and it is better to scrap up the whole affair of Agency division and go back to their original plan of having the Agency tract under the Collectors of Vizagapatam, Ganjam and Gōdāvari. I do not know whether I am entitled to give out to the House the decision of the Retrenchment Committee in this matter. As the hon. the Finance Member nods his head in disapproval, I would not divulge the secrets of that Committee."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—" I know that the House is somewhat impatient to get at the end of the business ; but I rise, on account of the general importance, to a point of order. The question is whether hon. Members of this House are entitled to refer to other than published results of the proceedings of committees such as the Retrenchment Committee."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" As a matter of fact Dr. Subbarayan has not been referring to that at all. So, the hon. the Law Member will wait till the hon. Member does refer to it."

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" Evidently the hon. the Law Member did not hear what I said. Probably I was not speaking loud enough for him to hear. I was not going to divulge any of the papers placed before the Retrenchment Committee. I was only going to urge the acceptance of my motion on general grounds."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—" I have corrected myself."

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" I think the time has come for the Government to consider this point and come to the conclusion that the Agency division has been a white elephant and give up the idea of having a separate Agency division and go back to the old plan. It has been said that the Agency division required exploiting. I think this idea has been exploded, because the geologists who exploited the Agency division for minerals have come to the conclusion that no such mineral wealth lies in the Agency as was expected. When such is the case it is but right that in the present financial stringency prevailing in the whole province we should adopt a policy of retrenchment as



21st March 1923]

[Dr. P. Subbarayan]

far as possible, and not spend large sums of money. When such is the case, I move for a total reduction of five lakhs from this grant just to show the disapproval of this House on the Agency policy followed by the Madras Government."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"In the first place I am sorry that my hon. friend did not favour the House with the name of the geologist of whom I know nothing, and who he said recently declared that there was no mineral wealth in the Agency. It would be of some assistance to us if he would give us some information about it. The hon. Member, though he disclaimed any intention of divulging the proceedings of the Retrenchment Committee, is no doubt in possession of some information about the Agency from the papers placed before the Retrenchment Committee. I have reason to think that the Retrenchment Committee was led to believe that a saving of something like 4 to 5 lakhs could be effected by the abolition of the separate Agency division."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Has the proceedings of the Retrenchment Committee to which the hon. Member referred been placed on the table of the House? Probably the hon. the Finance Member will tell us that."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"No, Sir."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Then, I do not think the hon. the Home Member can refer to that."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"Then I will not mention anything about the Retrenchment Committee, but I think I am entitled to say that a story has been going about within the precincts of this building that the abolition of the separate Agency division would result in a saving of four or five lakhs. I dare say that this story has reached the ears of my hon. friend below the gangway. The story, Sir, is incorrect. On the latest information we have come to the conclusion that far from the abolition of the Agency resulting in any saving it would actually result in extra expenditure. Under the circumstances, I very much doubt whether my hon. friend or other Members of the Council will be very much inclined to follow up the story. The explanation is simple. The original forecast made when the Agency division was constituted was that it would result in an expenditure of something like seven lakhs a year in the Agency. As a matter of fact, very large amounts under establishments have never been spent at all. A large amount of the establishment has been drawn from other districts and corresponding savings have been effected in those districts. I have, during the last few days, attempted to arrive at some estimate as to what the actual saving would be if we now abolish the Agency division and go back to the old arrangement. As far as I can make out with the help of the Agency Commissioner, the figure we can expect in the way of reduction would be from one to one and a half lakhs of rupees. Even that saving, of course, would be worth having, and I may say at once from the administrative point of view, I am entirely in favour of the abolition of the separate Agency division. I would much rather go back to the old arrangement, but it must be understood that this will not lead to any retrenchment. As the House will remember, the question of giving relief to the Collector of Kistna is a problem which has been before the Government and the public for many years past and it has been admitted on all hands that the Collector of Kistna must somehow be given relief. There was a scheme for the bifurcation of the district. As soon as the Agency division was created it was asked whether, taking into account the relief which

[Mr. A. R. Knapp]

[21st March 1923]

would be given to the Collectors of Godavari and Vizagapatam, by the institution of a separate Agency division, it would not be possible to make some redistribution which would allow us to avoid the creation of a new district, and on that basis enquiries have been going on. When we were contemplating the abolition of the separate Agency Commissionership, my hon. colleague, the Revenue Member, pointed out to me that if we did that, if we restored the Agency to the districts concerned, we would have to revert to the proposal to bifurcate the Kistna district. On a rough estimate the cost of so doing would be  $2\frac{1}{2}$  lakhs a year. The net result, if my hon. friend's motion is carried out and we revert to the old system, will be a net extra expenditure of one lakh."

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—" Though I am one in favour of retrenchment, I beg to oppose this motion. It was put forward at the time of the institution of a separate division for the Agency that it was for the benefit of the depressed classes that they were doing that. This benefit is still being given. As stated by the hon. the Home Member, if this Agency division is abolished, instead of resulting in a saving, it will only involve an extra expenditure of one lakh of rupees. I am therefore against the proposal for the abolition. Further, with the abolition of the Agency division, the staff will have to be provided for elsewhere. Taking these facts into consideration, I think we ought to leave the Agency division as it is.

" Another point which is lurking in the minds of some hon. Members is 4-45 p.m. that the formation of an Agency division and the location of the headquarters of Divisional Officers in far more distant places than usual was the cause for the recent trouble. Even the formation of divisions and taluk headquarters in the proper manner will prevent such nuisance. With these remarks I beg to oppose the motion before the House."

Sriman SASIBHUSHAN RATH Mahasayo :—" I have no mind to intervene in this debate, but for the fact that my hon. friend, Mr. Balaji Rao Nayudu, has thought it fit to oppose the motion. The Agency was established with the object of bringing into direct contact the hillmen and the officers of Government. In the Budget Memorandum for the year 1921 it is stated :

It is hoped that this change will result in bringing into direct contact the hillmen and the officers of Government and it is possible for introducing well-thought-out schemes for improving the health and education of the people and for developing the resources of that fertile tract of country.

I make this statement for want of time, viz., that this sort of arrangement has ended in Futuri. I am not going to give reasons because that will take a long time. I will simply say that this sort of 'direct contact' has ended in a Futuri. It has cost us a large sum of money. At the time of the Budget discussion just after this Agency tract was constituted into a separate division, it was stated that a sum of Rs.  $1\frac{1}{2}$  lakhs had to be spent and I took objection to it. Sir Lionel Davidson on the 10th March 1921, in reply to my speech, said that the recurring expenditure would only be Rs. 50,000. It was stated in paragraph 17 of the Financial Memorandum of that year that the recurring extra cost would amount to half a lakh. Sir Lionel Davidson said :

I venture to think that this half a lakh may in the near future be further reduced by the abolition of the posts of Personal Assistants to the Collectors of the Vizagapatam and Ganjam districts and possibly also Godavari—an issue which, I understand, is under examination though I cannot prophesy with certainty what the result will be. The critic whom I have in mind spoke of the extra cost as Rs.  $1\frac{1}{2}$  lakhs.



21st March 1923] [Sriman Sasibhushan Rath Mahasayo].

But, now I ask what is the actual state of affairs? If you refer to page 230 of the Budget you will find that in the year 1921 the amounts that were spent came to Rs. 30 lakhs. For the year 1922-23 we find we have spent Rs. 34 lakhs. We have budgeted for the coming year, that is 1923-24, for Rs. 36 lakhs. Thus you will see that the half a lakh of rupees spoken of by Sir Lionel Davidson was only the thin end of the wedge and that the expenditure goes on increasing. In this connexion I should like to refer to the speech Sir Lionel Davidson made on the 10th March 1921 when dealing with this subject. He said in reply to my observations that 'the extra cost would only be half a lakh'. Now I say it is much more. It is six times half a lakh. On general administration, for the year 1921-22, we spent Rupees 5,33,000. This year we have spent Rs. 6'07 lakhs on this head, and the Government have budgeted for Rs. 6'15 lakhs. For Police we spent Rs. 8 lakhs for the year 1921-22. It is Rs. 11 lakhs for the current year. For the coming year, which is a normal year, we have budgeted for Rs. 9 lakhs. Nearly 15 lakhs of rupees are proposed to be spent on these two heads for the next year. This is a circumstance which we cannot accept. We do not know whether this scheme will lead us anywhere definitely. If we accept this Agency scheme, we shall be providing, as I said in 1921, for further and further grants without any practical benefit to this Government or to the country. As I said, we have got 20,000 square miles constituting the Agency tracts, out of which 12,000 square miles belong to the Maharaja of Jeypore. The Government has nothing to do with it and cannot claim any of the mineral resources which belong to the Maharaja of Jeypore. So that this fertile tract of the country which is spoken of in that way very often, even if worked out, will not bring us any advantage. We have very few men as hill tribes. If we want to ameliorate their condition, if we want to root out malaria from those parts and take all such steps as will be conducive to the interests of the people, we have to spend a lot of money which we cannot afford to spend just at present. Therefore I say that the Agency scheme is a white elephant; we should drop it."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—"It has been stated that one of the reasons of the recent Fituri is the formation of the Agency division. If the Fituri has occurred in the Agency tracts alone then too the conclusion will not be correct. As a matter of fact, there have been Fituris once in twenty years. We had a trouble in 1876. Another trouble in 1879. Again we had a trouble in 1892. There have been similar troubles subsequently once or twice. It may be said that from the administrative point of view if the development of the Agency tracts has become an accomplished fact, and communications are developed constituting the whole tract as one unit it will be a very very convenient and desirable thing. It is unfortunate that the resources of the Government were not enough when the Agency division was formed and they were not able to put more money for the development of the country. It has been stated that the issue before the House is whether the bifurcation of the Kistna district is to be given effect to or the Agency division is to be continued. For my part the question is that as we have the Kistna district for the last three years without a bifurcation we can continue in the same way. It has been admitted on all hands that Kistna is a heavy district and requires bifurcation. The whole scheme was matured before the Agency scheme was pushed through. When the Agency was formed, the bifurcation of the Kistna district took a different shape. We felt that the work in the other three districts was lessening and instead of forming a separate district

[Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju] [21st March 1923]

we thought that Kistna and the other districts might be conveniently redistributed into four districts. This work was undertaken; it was examined by the Board of Revenue; and recently the Government issued a communiqué stating the various possibilities of effecting the redistribution of the districts into four districts without increasing the number of officers. It is a question that affects mostly the people of Kistna and therefore it is for the representatives and people of Kistna to criticise that policy. Local knowledge will be required to propose any alternative schemes to that put forward by the Government. When that is done, there will not be much difficulty. But now to move in the direction of the abolition of the Agency division is altogether undesirable. Only yesterday we were told that in the Legislative Assembly the Imperial budget was proposed to be balanced by effecting a compromise even in the matter of taxation. Under these circumstances I think the House will be well advised to put more money for the Agency division and not cut short any expenditure under that head."

Mr. M. SURYANARAYANA :—" I am sorry I cannot agree with either of my hon. friends, Mr. Balaji Rao Nayudu or Mr. Narasimha Raju, in their remarks regarding the Agency division. I am afraid the question of the bifurcation of the Kistna district has been unnecessarily mingled with the continuance of the Agency division. If, for administrative reasons, it is found absolutely necessary that the Kistna district should be bifurcated, it is irrespective of the fact whether the Agency division continues as a separate division or is abolished and the old state of things reverted to. We are not now concerned with the bifurcation of the Kistna district. What we are concerned with is: is it necessary for the Agency division to continue in the manner in which it is at present administered or should we abolish that system? I am entirely in favour of reverting to the old system. You have got a District Collector (a district magistrate) who tours round the whole district. It is absolutely necessary in the interests of the Agency people as well as in the interests of the people of the adjoining districts that one single officer should be in touch with the people. It seems to me that the bifurcation of the Ganjam, Vizagapatam and Godavari districts into three complete districts means the bifurcation of the Agency division which again means the alienation, as it were, of the Agency people and the officers who were administering the Agency tracts.

" I am afraid that this Agency division is really costing us much. I do not believe if we had no Agency division there would be an Agency District Superintendent of Police, and an Assistant Superintendent of Police, both stationed at the headquarters at Waltair, and be travelling from one end of the Godavari district to the other end of the Agency tracts in Ganjam district. I do not believe, in that case, that we would have a District Medical and Sanitary Officer with an assistant and a sub-assistant attached to him."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—" He was appointed in the year 1915."

Mr. M. SURYANARAYANA :—" He was a civil surgeon and not a District Medical and Sanitary Officer. That is a designation, I believe, that has been given to him. I do not believe that, if we revert to the old state of things and all these Agency officers and the three assistant commissioners were located at their headquarters within the limits of their jurisdiction, and if they were not outside their proper headquarters requiring at least more than 1½ days to reach their division, we would be able to save the large amount of travelling allowances which they are now getting.



21st March 1923]

[Mr. M. Suryanarayana]

“Then, Sir, the hon. Mr. Knapp has told us that even if we revert to the old state of things, there will not be a profit of more than  $1\frac{1}{2}$  lakhs or  $1\frac{1}{2}$  lakhs. I do not believe that this will be so.”

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—“May I ask him why he does not believe it, Sir?”

Mr. M. SURYANARAYANA :—“Because the figures have not been worked out. If the hon. Mr. Knapp has placed before us that the profit under certain item is so and so, and under certain other item is so and so, then I would not have said that I could not believe. What he has stated is only a rough estimate. I believe it will not be so very small. If we were to work out the figures it would be certainly high. Anyway, whether there would be any profit or not, we do not want a separate Agency Division. We wish that the jurisdiction of the Agency districts should be given to the District Magistrates, as it used to be in the past, and that they should be administered through the agency of the District Collectors and the Divisional Officers. By that system the Government would be managing the Agency tracts more efficiently and more in the interests of the people, than through the Agency Commissioners. I am afraid that both my hon. friends, Mr. Balaji Rao Nayudu and Mr. Narasimha Raju, are not justified in opposing the motion before the House.”

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“I was glad to hear from the hon. the Home Member that he quite approved the idea of going back to the old state of things, so far as the administration of the Agency tracts was concerned. He said that the amount of expenditure that would thus be saved would not be more than  $1\frac{1}{2}$  lakhs. I do not agree with him. I do not think the figures have been worked out. If the figures were worked we would certainly have more saving. We may carry on the administration of Kistna district, as it stands at present, and there is no urgent necessity for bifurcating it. Mr. Narasimha Raju said that more money ought to be put for the development of the Agency tracts. We have invested enough of money for its development during the last two years. But I do not think there has been any improvement in the finances of the province. Another point that I should like to place before the House is this: if a private individual wants to develop his property it is open to him to spend his money in developing it; but I do not think that Government ought to spend its money in developing private properties. This is one of the reasons why the Agency division should go. I would ask the Government not to control the Agency division the major portion of which belongs to the Maharaja of Jeypore but to allow the Maharaja to develop it in his own way.

“I do not think we need have to spend 5 lakhs under the heads of education, communication, etc. If Government were to come back to us with a supplementary grant for expending money under these heads, I think the whole department of Agency can be discussed again. Under the circumstances, I cannot but press the motion to a division.”

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—“I am somewhat surprised at what the previous speaker said. If I understood him right, his suggestion was that the Council should now cut the 5 lakhs of rupees and later on the Government should come back for a supplementary grant. Such institutions as we are dealing with, namely, schools, dispensaries, etc., are institutions that cannot be treated in a light-hearted manner. I do not know whether he means that we should shut such institutions down until next July or possibly until the new Council is formed.”

[21st March 1923]

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"The Civil Works Budget provides for 9 lakhs."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"That has nothing whatever to do with the formation of the Agency division."

"Sir, there has been a great deal of misunderstanding in the minds of hon. Members of this House as to the exact position of expenditure under this head. That is largely due to what I think has been rather the unfortunate experiment, that we have given a separate place in the Budget for the Agency division. Formerly the ordinary services in the Agency were shown under their appropriate heads. They were then regarded as proper and passed. The Agency was treated exactly like other places in the Presidency. It had a Revenue staff, a Police staff, and an Engineering staff and so on. No one thought fit to take objection when these items appeared under their own proper heads. But when for the purpose of convenience of this House these items have been brought together hon. Members rub their eyes in astonishment at the total and want to cut out of these 32 lakhs a sum of 5 lakhs, without, if I may say so, any real consideration of the particular direction in which they wish to reduce. The fact is that what we are now spending on establishments is practically no more than we have always been spending in the Agency tracts when they were in separate districts."

"The mover of the resolution just now made a suggestion that we are spending the money of the State for the development of the estate of a zamindar. We are spending nothing on that account."

Any such increase as there is goes to establishment, to the opening of a certain number of schools and a few dispensaries and the improvement of a few roads. One hon. Member doubted the correctness of my estimate of the saving which would result if we were to revert to the old system. I had the figures before I spoke. The saving is worked out on the following basis: one Agency Commissioner Rs. 36,000, two Revenue Divisional Officers Rs. 9,600, the staff of the two Rs. 4,000, the Agency Sessions Judge and staff Rs. 45,800, the inferior civil service post in connexion with the post of the Agency Commissioner Rs. 13,000, the District Surgeon Rs. 10,000, one Assistant Executive Engineer Rs. 4,000. The total comes to Rs. 1,22,400."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"After these reductions I should like to know whether the staff would be the same as it was before the Agency was redistributed."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"This would leave no staff which was not in existence when the Agency was created. The total comes to Rs. 1,22,400."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"What about the travelling allowance and other contingencies?"

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"The saving under travelling allowance would be very small."

Sriman SASIBHUSHAN RATH Mahasayo :—"What about their tents, mules and materials?"

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"The Collector going from Ganjam will certainly spend less than the Commissioner going from Waltair."



21st March 1923]

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—" On the other hand, Sir, we should have three officers travelling in the Agency instead of one. If my hon. friend seriously means to suggest that we should make a saving in travelling allowance, surely it is not the way of dealing with the question to propose a cut of 5 lakhs of rupees. As I explained at the outset, this Government on representations made were quite prepared to face the question of the abolition of the Agency division. On the occasion of the general discussion on the Budget, I stated in most explicit terms that we would be prepared to take any step however drastic which the Retrenchment Committee could show to be in the interest of the Presidency. To that position we adhere even now. The Retrenchment Committee have reported on the matter and the Government are about to take their report into consideration. Lastly, let me remind hon. Members that the motion before them is for an actual reduction of 5 lakhs. It is not a mere formal motion for a reduction of Rs. 100. If these 5 lakhs are to be cut off, we shall have to shut hospitals and schools. I trust that the House will recognise the seriousness of the position from that point of view and after this discussion, I hope my hon. friend will not press his motion."

The motion was put and carried and a poll was demanded and taken with the following result :—

*Ayes.*

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar. | 24. Mr. V. C. Vellingiri Goundar.                |
| 2. Mr. M. Appala Narasayya Nayudu.        | 25. Rao Bahadur C. Venkataranga Reddi.           |
| 3. Rao Bahadur V. Appaswami Vandayar.     | 26. Diwan Bahadur S. Rm. Ct. Pethachi Chettiyar. |
| 4. Diwan Bahadur C. Arunaobala Mudaliyar. | 27. Diwan Bahadur P. Kesava Pillai.              |
| 5. Rao Sahib S. Ellappa Chettiyar.        | 28. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu.       |
| 6. Rao Bahadur P. C. Etirejulu Nayudu.    | 29. Mr. P. Siva Rao.                             |
| 7. Rao Bahadur O. Tanikachala Chettiyar.  | 30. " C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar.              |
| 8. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar.        | 31. Mr. M. Suryanarayana.                        |
| 9. Rao Bahadur K. Gopalakrishnayya.       | 32. Sriraman Bisvanath Das.                      |
| 10. Mr. K. P. Gopala Menon.               | 33. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhacharlu.           |
| 11. " K. A. Kandaswami Kandar.            | 34. Rao Bahadur Dr. C. B. Rama Rao.              |
| 12. " J. Kuppuswami.                      | 35. Sriraman Sasi Bushana Rath.                  |
| 13. " B. Muniswami Nayudu.                | 36. Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar.                   |
| 14. " A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chettiyar.   | 37. " M. R. Seturatham Ayyar.                    |
| 15. Rao Bahadur C. Natesa Mudaliyar.      | 38. " A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.                   |
| 16. Mr. V. P. Pakkiriswami Pillai.        | 39. Raja of Ramnad.                              |
| 17. " P. T. Rajan.                        | 40. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampan.                   |
| 18. " W. P. A. Saundarapandiya Nadar.     | 41. Khan Sahib Saiyid Diwan Abdul Razaq Sahib.   |
| 19. " R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar.         | 42. Mr. Haji Abdulla Sahib.                      |
| 20. " K. Sitarama Reddi.                  | 43. Rao Sahib Sir M. C. Muttayya Chettiyar, Kt.  |
| 21. " T. Somasundara Mudaliyar.           |  |
| 22. " P. Subbarayan.                      |  |
| 23. " A. Tangavelu Nayagar.               |  |

*Noes.*

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter.                         | 13. Mr. E. F. Thomas.                           |
| 2. " Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur. | 14. " E. Periyaswamyam.                         |
| 3. " the Raja of Panagal.                                  | 15. " A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar.                   |
| 4. " Rai Bahadur K. Venkatarreddi Nayudu.                  | 16. " S. T. Shanmukham Pillai.                  |
| 5. " Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro.                              | 17. S. R. Y. Ankinedu Prasad Bahadur.           |
| 6. " Mr. A. R. Knapp.                                      | 18. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu.           |
| 7. " Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar.                            | 19. Mr. S. Somasundaram Pillai.                 |
| 8. Mr. E. S. Lloyd.  | 20. Diwan Bahadur K. Suryanarayanamurti Nayudu. |
| 9. " A. Y. G. Campbell.                                    | 21. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju.        |
| 10. " C. Madhavan Nayar.                                   | 22. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu.      |
| 11. " T. Richmond.   | 23. Mr. S. Muttumanikkachari.                   |
| 12. Diwan Bahadur T. N. Sivagnanam Pillai.                 | 24. The Rev. W. Meston.                         |

[21st March 1923]

*Noes—cont.*

- 25. Mr. M. Ratnaswami.
- 26. „ C. R. T. Congreve.
- 27. Abbas Ali Khan Bahadur.
- 28. Rao Bahadur M. C. Raja.

- 29. Mr. L. C. Guruswami.
- 30. Rao Sahib P. Venkatarangayya.
- 31. Mr. A. M. MacDougall.
- 32. Rao Bahadur T. Namburupal Chettiyar.

*Neutral.*

- 1. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar.
- 2. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Panja.
- 3. Mr. A. Subbarayudu.

- 4. Khan Sahib Munshi Muhammad Abdur Rahman Sahib.

43 voted *for* the motion and 32 voted *against* it ; 4 remained *neutral*.

The motion was carried and the reduction was made.

The Demand XXXIV *minus* five lakhs was put and carried.

#### DEMAND XXXV—REPAYMENT OF LOAN.

Demand XXXV for Repayment of loan for a sum not exceeding 17.92 lakhs was put and carried.

#### DEMAND XXXVI—LOANS AND ADVANCES BY THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT.

Demand XXXVI for Loans and Advances by the Provincial Government for a sum not exceeding 70.02 lakhs of rupees was put and carried and the grant was made.

The House then rose for the day (at 5-15 p.m.) to meet again at 14 of the clock on Thursday, the 22nd March 1923.

L. D. SWAMIKANNU,  
*Secretary to the Legislative Council.*

வாய்மையே வெல்லும்  
TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS